DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 693 95 JC 760 572

AUTHOR	Dziuba, Victoria, Ed.; Meardy, William, Ed.
TITLE	Enhancing Trustee Effectiveness. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 15.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	109p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 615 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California 94111 ($5.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bibliographies; *Board Administrator Relationship; Community Colleges; Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; Females; Futures (of Society); *Governing Boards; *Junior Colleges; Legal Problems; Legal Responsibility; Policy Formation; Political Influences; Presidents; Self Evaluation; *Trustees
IDENTIFIERS	Lobbying; Trustee Responsibility; *Trustee Role; Trustee Selection

ABSTRACT

The challenges facing governing boards today have never been greater. Financial constraints, as well as legal questions, increases in teacher militancy, collective bargaining, affirmative action, and other thorny issues, make the job of the trustee increasingly complex. The 16 articles in this sourcebook examine the role of the community college trustee and present recommendations for improving trustee effectiveness. The authors recommend that trustees become more aware of the legal problems inherent in their jobs; that they become skilled in working with state and federal legislators in achieving institutional goals and in curtailing the ever-increasing state domination of community college decision-making; that they engage in continuing self-evaluation; that they work with the president as a management partner, rather than as an adversary; and that they eschew written policies and allow the president maximum flexibility. Also presented are: (1) predictions of the future course of undergraduate education, (2) a cost/benefit analysis of appointing trustees versus electing them, (3) a self-evaluation instrument for trustee use, (4) guidelines for achieving financial stability, (5) suggestions for improving the effectiveness of board meetings and of female board members, and (6) a review of additional pertinent literature and a bibliography. (Author/DC)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED130693

new directions for community colleges

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

a quarterly sourcebook edited by
Arthur M. Cohen and Florence B. Brawer
and sponsored by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

JC 760 572

number 15
autumn 1976

enhancing trustee effectiveness

victoria dziuba
william meardy
issue editors

3

Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers
San Francisco • Washington • London

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER
ERIC
Clearinghouse For Junior Colleges
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

ENHANCING TRUSTEE EFFECTIVENESS
New Directions for Community Colleges
Volume IV, Number 3, Autumn 1976
Victoria Dziuba, William Meardy, Issue Editors

New Directions for Community Colleges is published quarterly by Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, in association with the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. Subscriptions are available at the regular rate for institutions, libraries, and agencies of $25 for one year. Individuals may subscribe at the special professional rate of $15 for one year. *New Directions* is numbered sequentially—please order extra copies by sequential number. The volume and issue numbers above are included for the convenience of libraries.

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Association of Community College Trustees for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the Association of Community College Trustees or the National Institute of Education.

Correspondence:
Subscriptions, single-issue orders, change of address notices, undelivered copies, and other correspondence should be sent to *New Directions* Subscriptions, Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 615 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California 94111. Editorial correspondence should be sent to the Editor-in-Chief, Arthur M. Cohen, at the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024.

Library of Congress Catalogue Card Number 76-586

Cover design by Willi Baum
Manufactured in the United States of America

contents

editors' notes — *victoria dziuba*, *william meardy* — vii

responsibilities — *george e. potter* — 1

An effective board has at least eleven tasks, from selecting the president to constructing buildings and evaluating institutional performance.

changing roles — *beatrice doser* — 9

Today's trustee must be informed on local, state, and national issues related to his institution and be prepared to work actively on its behalf.

trustee selection: who gets what, who pays what? — *charles h. polk*, *vaughn a. lacombe*, *jeanne goddard* — 15

A cost/benefit analysis of appointing trustees versus electing them.

the challenge of being a female trustee — *joyce a. smith* — 21

Who opens the door is unimportant; what counts is making sure the community college is open to all who can benefit from it.

self-evaluation, key to accountability — *charles h. polk*, *henry c. coleman, jr.* — 27

Accountability and self-evaluation must be considered a high priority by all trustees if they are concerned about their performance.

building the management team — *charles h. polk*, *vaughn a. lacombe*, *jeanne goddard* — 33

"The old dichotomy between policy making and administration no longer applies," so the board and president must be management partners, not adversaries.

policy development — *b. a. jensen* — 39

Reasons for throwing out written policies and creating an atmosphere conducive to strong and innovative personal management.

5

the law and the board *george e. potter* 45

As students, faculty members, and the public bring more suits, trustees must become aware of potential legal problems and secure competent legal advice.

preparing for collective bargaining *richard a. gardiner* 53

A case study analysis of the effects of stress on the members of one board's bargaining team.

trustees, lobbying, and legislators *walter b. calvert* 61

Effective board members understand and are involved in politics at all governmental levels.

a hard look at finance *fred l. mathews* 65

The basic methods for bringing financial stability out of chaos, with particular attention to the board's responsibility for a balanced budget.

secrets of a board chairman *margaret c. k. gibbs* 69

After visiting the board meetings of nineteen southern California community colleges, the author suggests some successful procedures for overcoming busywork, docility, and apathy.

governance relationships and tasks *donald a. seifert* 79

The role of the chairman and his special relationship with the president are discussed, as well as recommendations for handling public criticism and the media.

the enrollment crisis in california *mildred h. wharton* 85

A look at the pinch caused by an increasing demand for services and a decreasing resources, with emphasis on the experience of West Valley Community College.

futures *charles mcintyre* 93

What lies ahead for the community colleges? Competition with alternative institutions and a decrease in vocational preparation are two probabilities.

sources and information *elizabeth rinnander* 99

Further resources on effective trusteeship, from the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

index 107

editors' notes

This issue of *New Directions for Community Colleges* examines from various aspects the strategic part played by community college trustees as members of the board/president management team.

The contributors represent a wide variety of professional backgrounds and geographic locations. Their opinions, generated from years of education and practical experience, will be useful to trustees, presidents, and others concerned with promoting the community college concept. We hope these viewpoints will fill a gap that exists in much of literature on the two-year college.

The challenges facing governing boards today have never been greater. Financial constraints, as well as legal questions, the energy crisis, increases in teacher militancy, collective bargaining, affirmative action, and other thorny issues, make the job of the trustees increasingly complex. In addition to identifying various challenges and responsibilities, the authors have offered techniques for improving the trustees' tools of boardmanship. Especially in this line of work, sharing experiences is a very important method of learning, which the Association of Community College Trustees encourages among its members.

ACCT is a nationwide organization designed especially for the trustee–a lay person who has been either elected or appointed to the district board of directors of a two-year postsecondary institution. Via seminars, conventions, regular publications, and special reports, ACCT emphasizes trustee education. Experience shows that responsible, knowledgeable trustees are better able to make the kind of policy decisions that not only improve the quality of education but also serve the needs of the students and strengthen the roles of the chief executive. In having a unified voice representing them in Washington, D.C., community college trustees are not only being heard where it counts, but also are establishing their own identity.

Victoria Dziuba
William Meardy
Issue Editors

Victoria Dziuba is director of trustee services and William Meardy is executive director of the Association of Community College Trustees, with offices at 955 L'Enfant Plaza, N., S.W. Washington, D.C. 20024.

An effective board has at least eleven tasks, from selecting the president to constructing buildings and evaluating institutional performance.

responsibilities

george e. potter

Conditions affecting our community colleges are changing rapidly. The advent of collective bargaining is formalizing an adversary relationship between boards and their employees. Enrollments are leveling off in some institutions and even declining in a few. Statewide coordinating boards are encroaching more and more on the authority of local boards. Governors, legislatures, and the public at large are demanding that we be more accountable not only for the way we spend tax revenues, but also for the effectiveness, and even value, of our educational programs. Tax dollars, whether from local, state, or federal sources, are becoming more scarce. These are only a few of the factors that make our jobs as community college trustees more difficult and yet more challenging. Further, they are causing us to more carefully examine and effectively carry out our responsibilities as trustees.

What are the characteristics of an effective college board? It is one whose members come from diverse backgrounds but share one common bond, a deep love for the college. The sole concern of the trustees is the welfare of the college and the community it serves. Members of the effective board are active, dedicated, involved, and, most of all, informed. The effective board does not rubber-stamp the president but does place considerable weight on his recommendations. The effective board insists on being the policymaker for all aspects of institutional life but refuses to meddle in the administration of the college. The effective board considers itself a team on which each trustee has great respect and affection for his or her colleagues as well as for the president.

What are the responsibilities which, if fulfilled by all board members, make an effective board? I think we trustees have at least eleven major responsibilities.

1. *Selecting, evaluating, and terminating the president.* This responsibility is an obvious and extremely important one. Unfortunately, although all boards recognize the necessity to choose and perhaps fire the president, many do not recognize the need to evaluate his performance regularly. To do this task properly, the board must establish criteria which have been agreed upon by both parties. The president, as the board's agent for managing the institution, is not selected to win popularity contests with students, faculty members, or even the other administrators. He is selected to administer the college in accordance with the policies established by the board.

There are almost as many methods for selecting a president as there are colleges. The last time our board hired a new president we established a screening committee consisting of two trustees, two administrators, two faculty members, and two students. The committee was to refer at least five candidates to the board with the understanding that the board could accept one of the candidates or reject all of them and select someone else. Each of the five who were ultimately referred came to the campus for a one-day visit when he met with representatives of all the college constituencies and had dinner with the board, accompanied by his spouse. After all the candidates had visited the college, these representatives met separately with the board to give their group's evaluations of each candidate. The board then selected one. Although the staff and students recognized that ultimately the board must hire the president, they did express satisfaction with their part in the decision.

2. *Ensuring professional management of the institution.* Probably the most important responsibility is making sure that the college is managed in a businesslike manner. The board must adopt a budget which realistically projects the college's income and restricts the expenditures to that income. The budget should also reflect the priorities of the institution as established by the board. The board must insist that the president handle the affairs of the institution in

a professional way, because it has the final responsibility for the fiscal integrity of the college.

A few years ago we adopted a management by objectives system for our administrators and department chairmen. We did not expect spectacular results, and such results were not obtained. Nevertheless, the system is working well and has improved the administration of the college. We also adopted an administrator's salary plan with the help of Ernst and Ernst, a certified public accounting firm. The plan contains eleven salary grades, each of which has a range of salaries, and all are revised biannually. When a new administrative position is created, the board approves the position and its salary grade. The president is then given complete authority to hire, or fire, the person for that job and set his salary within the salary range. In addition, the president annually sets the salary of each administrator within the salary ranges previously adopted by the board.

3. *Purchasing, constructing, and maintaining facilities.* The board is responsible for determining what land should be purchased deciding what buildings will be built and in which order, selecting the architect to design the buildings, and providing adequate resources for the maintenance of the facilities once they are purchased or constructed. This does not mean, however, that the board should involve itself in the details of each building constructed. The number of classrooms, number of teaching stations in each classroom, and the like, are primarily educational matters which can best be determined by members of the staff.

Before a spade of earth was turned, our board adopted a master plan for the development of the campus. The plan was prepared by an architectural firm with suggestions from the faculty, administration, and board. Once the plan was adopted, the board, after receiving all necessary information and the recommendation of the president, determined in which order the buildings would be constructed. As needs changed the master plan changed, and there have been two revisions in ten years.

4. *Defining the role and mission of the college.* Obtaining the views of the faculty, student body, administration, and even the general public is desirable in carrying out this responsibility. However, final authority must rest with the board. Subject to the restrictions imposed by state law or by a state agency, the board should determine whether the institution is to be a comprehensive community college, offering programs in all fields, or is to emphasize

the liberal arts, occupational education, or even community service. The purpose of the college should be manifest in specific institutional goals.

When our college district was created, one of the board's first acts was to adopt a statement of purpose. In 1963 a committee, consisting again of students, faculty members, administrators, and trustees, prepared a revised mission statement for the college and a list of institutional objectives related to it. The statement, shown below, was then adopted by the board.

Jackson Community College shall promote the educational advancement of the total community within the college service area. The college shall offer educational experiences designed to promote maximum development of each student's potential throughout his lifetime; further, the college shall encourage and provide career education based upon individual choice. The college shall actively involve individuals and groups in its programs of instruction, cultural activities, guidance, and library services, as well as student activities. Through the free and open exchange of ideas, the college shall provide intellectual experiences which add meaning, scope, richness and interest to the life of each student. The college shall provide educational opportunities, services, and facilities to accomplish the mission of the college within its financial and personnel limitations.

The specific objectives are the following:

(1) Offering the guidance and financial aid services, including testing, necessary to enable students to discover and follow suitable preparation for chosen careers, to detect errors or deficiencies in earlier preparation for these careers, and to encourage students to make the best use of their aptitudes and interests.

(2) Providing fully accredited instruction.

(3) Providing the first two years of instruction for students who wish to transfer college credit and pursue their education in other institutions.

(4) Providing instruction in a variety of careers to the level required for responsible employment, such as instruction approved for apprenticeship, journeyman, and full-time trade, health, and other occupational programs.

(5) Providing instruction and experiences intended to promote better understanding of human nature, of the history and prin-

ciples of human society, and of ethical conduct. Also offered is the opportunity to explore man's relationship to his environment and to prepare for responsible citizenship and family life.

(6) Maintaining a program of preparatory and developmental courses to enable students who may, or may not have completed high school to continue successfully in general, occupational, or transfer curricula.

(7) Maintaining a core program of general education courses and a variety of enrichment courses.

(8) Welcoming students from various racial, national, language, religious, economic, and social backgrounds, and fostering an understanding of the diversity of an open and pluralistic society.

(9) Encouraging, supporting, and cooperating with educational units, civic groups, foundations, private individuals, government agencies and corporations in endeavors likely to result in advantage to the community.

(10) Promoting, facilitating, and coordinating community offerings of university extension courses for advanced credit.

(11) Offering a program of activities under responsible supervision providing students experience in working together, performing in public, and developing leadership qualities, creativity, and physical and mental skills.

(12) Contributing to and promoting the cultural, intellectual, and social, and economic life of residents of the community and the development of avocational interests.

(13) Fostering an environment conducive to making optimum progress toward the previously stated objectives.

(14) Maintaining a sound management approach to enhance and facilitate the programs of the college.

5. *Engaging in public relations.* Whether appointed or elected, the trustees are generally seen as representatives of the community served by the college and as representatives of the college to that community. Public relations, however, involves more than just promoting the institution. It requires a complete knowledge and understanding of the institution so that the trustee can, when necessary, calm an irate taxpayer or educate a misinformed legislator. The trustee may have to, and indeed, defend the institution and its policies to the community. In turn, the trustees must communicate the needs, expectations, and feelings of the community to the institution.

One of the most effective public relations tools our college has is the Associates of Jackson Community College, a broadly representative group of three hundred community leaders who, with their spouses, gather on campus at least three times a year. Normally, at least two of these events consist of a dinner followed by entertainment by a college performing group and a program. The Associates was created by the board, and the trustees work closely with its members. The purpose of the Associates is to provide a large group of informed friends of the college who can speak out for the institution in the community and can tell the college about the community's feelings.

6. *Preserving institutional independence.* If an institution is to prosper, the trustees must resist encroachment on its independence from any possible direction. For instance, a statewide coordinating board may feel that it can better govern the institution. The legislature may try meddle in its internal affairs. Or a citizen group might attempt to interfere with the free and open exchange of ideas on the campus.

The other trustees and I work very closely with the president in our dealings with the State Board of Education—Michigan's coordinating board for higher education—and the state legislature. As elected trustees, we generally have more influence on elected legislators because we also represent people and votes. We also occasionally face efforts by some citizens to prevent certain speakers from appearing on campus or certain courses from being offered. We feel that trustees, as their elected representatives, are the persons responsible for dealing with these citizens and resisting their efforts.

7. *Evaluating institutional performance.* Undoubtedly one of the most neglected responsibilities is evaluating how well the institution performing the role established by the board. An accurate assessment can be made only by establishing institutional goals and then measuring how well they are achieved. Is the transfer program adequately preparing students for four-year colleges? Are occupational students being adequately trained for jobs and are they being hired by the employers in the community? Is the institution really recruiting disadvantaged students? Is the developmental program training them to do college work? These are only a few of the questions that an effective board asks regularly.

8. *Creating a climate for change.* An effective board must insist on innovation, because teachers, and even administrators, are notoriously conservative when it comes to change. Their task is

easier and they risk no failure if the educational program stays the same. For example, teachers prefer bright students and thus are not likely to develop programs to serve the not so bright. Change, not for its own sake, but for the sake of improvement, must be encouraged. An effective board demands that programs be developed to meet the needs of new groups of people not currently being served by the college.

Our board believes this is one of its most important responsibilities. New programs mean new services to the community, and these new services inevitably mean increased enrollment. Since 1971 our full-time-equivalent enrollment has increased from 2,100 to more than 3,800 and our headcount enrollment has increased from 3,500 to 10,[illegible]00. This growth has been achieved in a college district that did not have a significant population increase during that period. Further, our percentage of in-district students has risen from 85 percent to 89 percent. Most of this increase is due to developing new programs for serving new students.

9. *Insisting on being informed.* Responsible trustees know about all aspects of the institution, because complete information is necessary to carry out all their responsibilities. I have no sympathy for those who frequently complain that they don't have time to read all of the materials furnished them by the president. If they are unwilling to take the time to be informed, they have no business being on the board. Being completely informed involves more than reading the board materials. For example, we subscribe to the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Community and Junior College Journal* for all our board members. Copies of books on college trusteeship and other college matters are also furnished. We attend conventions, seminars, workshops, as well as college functions of every sort. This responsibility was probably best put by John Corson in an article in *AGB Reports*: "I prescribe that trustees keep their noses in operations and that they keep their fingers out."

10. *Engaging in planning.* The board must see that the institution effectively makes comprehensive and continuous plans, both short-range and long-range. All members of the institution should participate in planning, including the trustees, who should not just rubber stamp plans prepared by other people. An effective planning device used by some boards is the annual retreat. In our case, the trustees, the president, and the administrators reporting to the president go to a motel in a neighboring town so that we can eliminate possible interruptions. We meet for two days, devoting our time primarily to planning.

11. *Assessing board performance.* Even those boards that regularly evaluate the performance of the college and the president seldom examine their own accomplishments. Does your board clearly understand its responsibilities? Do you do any internal planning for the operations of the board? Every board should set aside a period of time yearly to review its own performance with the goal of improving its own effectiveness. We attempt to do this at our annual retreat.

I believe completely in the concept that our institutions of higher education must be governed by lay trustees. Unfortunately, there are those who disagree. For example, in 1968, a group of students at Princeton University stated, "The issue is not whether the trustees are doing their job well. The issue is that there is no justification for such a group of men controlling the destiny of an institution in a community in which they have no legitimate place. The university is a community of students and faculty, not businessmen." If the feelings of those students were implemented, the result would be, in my opinion, catastrophic. However, unless we trustees fulfill those responsibilities which are ours both legally and morally, an increasing number of people will accept the views of the Princeton students. Unless all of our institutions become governed by effective boards consisting of properly motivated, committed trustees, there is every possibility that lay governing boards will become as extinct as the dinosaur.

George E. Potter is a trustee of Jackson Community College in Jackson, Michigan.

Today's trustee must be informed on local, state, and national issues related to his institution and be prepared to work actively on its behalf.

changing roles

beatrice doser

At one time the operating funds for community colleges were derived from three equal sources: local taxes, tuition, and state support. But local millage votes have been failing, and the view that community colleges should be free or at least have very low tuitions is more prevalent than ever. As a result, states are being asked to provide much more than one-third.

And here lies the problem—when local finances were providing the greater share of the support, there was no really valid argument against local governing decisions, but now legislators are being held accountable, so they in turn want accountability from trustees. They want to approve programs, buildings, and ten-year master plans. Bear in mind that their set of goals and priorities for the good of the state differs from what trustees may want for the good of the institution, and the legislators hold the purse strings. The formulas they set tend to make everyone equal, but do not provide well for the different roles of individual institutions. For example, if they believe education for the health occupations should be increased to meet state needs, then all community colleges will probably receive a high level of support for such training, regardless of the varying costs of particular programs. So if a college board has different aims from those of the state, they had better do something. It is time for trustees as elected officials speaking to elected officials to move. Today it's their responsibility, whether they like it or not, to become effective lobbyists for their institution; they must act repeatedly and forcefully.

There is another creeping change occurring at the state level: the increase of state boards of coordination or control—with the emphasis on the latter. Individual institutions sense the need for coordination and cooperation, as the growth of consortia demonstrates. But voluntary associations are not likely to satisfy this need at the state level because their members find it too difficult to be critical of each other and too easy to withdraw. Thus the coordination role is taken over by a state board, which does not view the roles of local boards in the same light as most trustees. Members of the state board feel community colleges are competing with each other for dollars, students, and service areas to the point where a referee with a quick whistle is a necessity. The steps from loose coordination to tight coordination and control can go almost unnoticed. As that happens, colleges are transformed from individual institutions, reacting to local needs in unique ways, to just parts of a system, and all in the name of public interest. Don't misunderstand me, there are many valid reasons for state coordinating boards, but trustees have a responsibility to examine these boards carefully and be in a position to propose as well as oppose, a position that requires trustee education and effort.

Most of the changes on the state level have the effect of limiting the autonomy of local institutions, and on the federal level the situation is the same. The federal funding pattern has led to confusion. Only an extremely adventurous or naive board would do any long-range planning based on federal monies. A significant portion of these funds is available only through categorical grants that allow the federal government to encourage the development of institutional programs tailored to national priorities. This procedure has spawned a bureaucracy of "grantsmanship," and an unwary board may awake later to find itself committed to a direction and an allocation of resources inconsistent and even in conflict with its purposes. Another source of problems is twelfth-hour legislation and appropriations, particularly in relation to student aid. Students need to know precisely what funds are available, not *maybe* and *if*. Guidelines and regulations must be available long enough in advance so they can be approached rationally. Today's trustees have the responsibility to act as the catalyst for changing this federal pattern.

Changes are occurring locally, too. At one time the public regarded the typical trustee as a middle-aged or elderly, well-established, male do-gooder or an exceptional person eager to get a little exposure before running for mayor or the legislature, but all were considered good people whose motivation and judgments were worthy and above reproach. Now, both public opinion and the composition of boards are changing. Minorities, women, young people, even students are appearing on boards. And the whole conglomeration of issues related to conflict of interest, open meetings, public disclosure, and accountability, coupled with a rising frustration over state and national events, has caused the general public to look critically at local units of government. Board meetings, which used to be held with members, staff people, and an occasional reporter present, are now attracting sizable crowds. When community groups file in with petitions and requests, trustees must realize that the noise and clamor really represent democracy at work and that local boards fulfill the principle that government is best when it is close to the action and the people it serves.

At the same time, trustees must be responsible and objective. The presence of vocal special-interest groups sometimes prompts board members to make extreme statements which are designed to please those in attendance but which are actually harmful to the institution. But the board's trust is too broad to be dictated by any segment of the population; its members *must* represent everyone and somehow arrive at decisions that combine the best interests of the public and the college. They must take seriously the dual responsibility of representing the public in decisions regarding the institution and of defending the institution in the eyes of the public. Their job is to preserve and protect the assets of the college, and one of those is its reputation.

A short time ago, if students knew trustees existed, they viewed them as outsiders whose names appeared on programs and in catalogs and who came to the campus on special occasions, particularly before elections, to help the administration hand out certificates and awards. Back then, 5 to 10 percent of graduating high school students were involved in higher education; they were occupied with learning, and there was a gate at the end of the path which opened to better jobs at higher salaries. Now about half the high school graduates have educational plans, but the paths do not necessarily lead to jobs; and fellow students who become hourly laborers may well have greater job security, less responsibility, and more take-home pay after a few years at work than those who elect to go to college. It's no wonder today's students are taking a more critical look at boards. They think of trustees as dictatorial, narrow-minded, establishment old bags who couldn't possibly understand or sympathize with the problems students face.

In this era of consumerism, students are the consumers of the community colleges. The board, faculty, and administration may all believe a college is great, but it will never be great unless the students think so; it will not even survive unless the students come. The community college student is a new type of student whose average age is over twenty-five and who is most likely attending part time. Students' goals are becoming more diverse and more important, and trustees must attempt to match their aims with those of the institution. Thus, the college's mission will have to be reviewed and changed frequently. Boards must also examine the advertising used to attract students. Is it honest? Many colleges will be in trouble as "truth in advertising" laws are extended to the public sector. Trustees who don't see the handwriting on the wall may expect to be sued. Students have already filed to recover costs from institutions on the grounds that a course did not meet the catalog description.

Faculties view boards as seven laymen who meet for *four* hours a month and make all the educational decisions. With the advent of collective bargaining, the friendly partnership—the collegiality of faculty and board—flew the coop. The resulting adversary relationship is fanned by real grievances, threatened grievances, and charges of unfair labor practices when bargaining itself is not the issue. Faculty unions in many states now vow to win at the board table what they have not been able to win at the bargaining table, and they have been successful in electing their candidates.

Administrators regard trustees as a personnel problem requiring careful handling, a group who may adopt good ideas as their policy, a group to be educated with reams of material put together in such a way that it will be read with the ease of a racy novel and yet contain all the information of a standard encyclopedia. They also regard the board as the unit to whom the buck passes when the situation gets out of hand.

Traditionally, the board picked the president, the president picked the administration, then the board forgot the administration, except when the time for determining annual salary increments rolled around, and even then these decisions were handled rather routinely. The cardinal rule prohibited the board from being involved in administration. If things went sour, they fired the president and began again. Now, with accountability a factor, I contend that boards should still keep their hands off the administration, but they should keep their noses in. They should not be involved in doing, but in knowing what is being done. The legal responsibilities placed on boards demand this. They must support, monitor, and give direction.

Boards need to develop goals and priorities so that issues are dealt with deliberately, not in response to crisis. Programs and policies must be soundly based, measurable, and attainable. For example, an affirmative action program that actively recruits minority faculty members can be measured in numbers. To perform these tasks effectively, trustees must be informed not only on local issues but on state and national issues. They must also be prepared to "defend their turf," because four-year colleges and proprietary institutions are envious of the continued enrollment increases at community colleges and they are trying to take a larger share of the market by establishing branch campuses and duplicating programs and community services.

In summation, to fulfill their changing roles, board members must establish sound educational aims and procedures in accord with the wishes and needs of the community. Most of all, they must know what they have to do and be committed to doing it. A trustee who reads the agenda before putting in his two to four hours at a board meeting and feels he's doing a great job is sadly out of touch with reality. The scope of trusteeship, that precious trust granted by the people, is more involved and more demanding. A board that makes decisions in a narrow, casual manner will wake up to find it has no decisions left to make—the college may still have academic freedom but all the institutional freedoms have vanished.

Beatrice Doser is chairperson of the Montcalm Community College Board of Trustees, Sidney, Michigan, as well as vice-president of the Michigan Community College Association.

A cost/benefit analysis of appointing trustees versus electing them.

trustee selection: who gets what, who pays what?

charles h. polk
vaughan a. lacombe
jeanne goddard

There are two principal ways to choose a community college trustee and over the years much has been written about which of the two is "better." But to our knowledge nothing has been written about the personal politics of appointment versus election. Why would a person want to be appointed a trustee? Why would a person want to be elected one? What does an appointing official, a governor, for example, have to consider when he appoints a trustee? What does the public get? What can the voter expect when he elects a trustee?

The selection of a trustee is a political act, and each actor (appointing authority, voter, trustee, college president) in the process pays a certain price and, we hope, reaps a certain benefit from it. By the cost we mean any detriment, or potential detriment, that an actor may suffer or any obligation or favor an actor may owe as the result of a trustee's being appointed or elected.

14/15

At one time, perhaps before 1960, the job of a trustee was much less costly, in this sense, than it is today. We are all familiar with the many academic challenges and problems that have arisen since then, including public demands for greater trustee accountability. Nevertheless, some still seek the job while some are sought for it. A person who wants the job normally pays the cost in the future, whereas a person being sought for the position has probably already paid. And both will reap whatever benefits they derive from the trusteeship in the future.

Whether the candidate is seeking or sought after, he is likely to have primarily altruistic or self-gaining motives. Although the altruist may exhibit self-gaining behavior as a means to obtaining his appointment and thereby serving his community, the true self-aggrandizer sees the appointment only as a step in his own advancement. Frequently, an appointment is a pay-off to the altruistic candidate for past services to the community or party. There is, after all, some prestige and honor connected with a community college trusteeship. And even though the trustee is not normally paid directly for his services, he may sometimes represent his college at conventions, seminars, and government functions and be reimbursed for his travel expenses.

Politically astute, the self-gaining candidate knows that as a trustee he will have a platform from which he can become better known and that he can use this increased visibility to his own advantage. These benefits may not be all political. For example, the proprietor of a business or a salesman may use his increased visibility to attract more business; the public will, he hopes, see all the public service he is rendering and patronize his business. His payment for these benefits is the hours he puts in as a trustee. Though no one, we are sure, has ever done a balance sheet, this second type of trustee probably "gets his money's worth."

When an appointing authority, a governor, for example, names a trustee, what benefits does he derive from the appointment and what costs does he pay? The answers depend in part on how well he is able to control his local party leaders, who generally make recommendations regarding his local appointments and who also put forward nominees when trustees are to be elected. If the governor has strong control, he gets the candidates he wants, and the difference between the types of trustee derived from each selection process will be reduced.

The minimum qualification—and hence a benefit—that a governor looks for in a candidate is the ability to not embarrass either him or his party. Beyond that, he may look for more benefits than he can accrue, because he must consider the political debts he owes to certain supporters. By appointing a member of their group, or someone they are sponsoring, he can settle a debt and establish stronger political ties with them. On the positive side, the appointing authority may be trying to establish or strengthen a representative-constituency relationship with another group. By selecting one of its members or its nominee, he may be able to promote that relationship.

The costs to the governor derive from our political system, in which any appointment is likely to be opposed by one or more groups who are trying to prevent the leader from establishing stronger political ties with their adversaries. Thus, although the governor is almost bound to alienate some people, he tries to use his power carefully, strengthening more relationships than he weakens. In so doing, he increases the benefits of his political appointments and minimizes the costs.

Over the long term, the governor may occasionally decide against the recommendations for trustee appointments from the groups with which he has strong political relationships. If he does it too often, though, he may find himself without their support when he needs it. It is therefore possible for the governor to pay the ultimate political price for a trustee appointment, loss of office, if enough voters should disagree with his choice strongly enough to vote against him at the next election.

The governor also derives a management benefit from the appointment process. Because he controls the selection, he can set guidelines for the type of person he thinks should be chosen and then carry through on those guidelines. When a trustee is elected, it is impossible for him to exercise so much control. Thus the voters receive the benefit of having two means by which to judge the appointing official: his guidelines and his actual selection of a trustee. Should they disagree enough with his appointment, they can vote against him in the next election.

But the voters, like the governor, probably pay a price for the appointment. One cost is that the appointed trustee is not directly accountable to them for his actions. Sometimes, as appointed board members search for the public interest, they ignore or discount the interest of a few or many voters, particularly those who are poor, unorganized, or relatively powerless in the political arena. Second, if the voters are members of a group which opposes the person selected, they lose the appointment of their favorite. Third, should the trustee later act against a voter's interest, the voter has paid a delayed price for the trustee's appointment.

The benefits and costs to the president of the community college, and to the college itself, vary according to whether the trustee is appointed or elected. Because groups within the college are increasingly drawing a line between themselves and the administration, adversarial relationships develop. If board and president are to reverse this trend and work together constructively and harmoniously, they must become partners in management, counseling and assisting each other in their separate functions of policy making and administration. This kind of relationship is facilitated if each member of the management team, including trustees, looks out for the public interest instead of each one tending to the interests of that part of the public which he considers to be his constituency. There is a better chance of getting a person concerned with the public interest through appointment, because the elected trustee is considerably more open to political pressure from interest groups.

The cost to the president and college is similar to what the voters pay: the possibility of getting a trustee who will not fulfill his responsibilities or who will not represent the best interest of the institution. This result is especially likely if the appointing authority, or those who advise him, do not recognize the importance of the selection. Other members of the college community–the faculty, staff, and students–pay by having only an indirect means of holding the trustee accountable and by possibly being ignored in the trustee's search for the public interest.

The board as a whole pays a certain price for being appointed –less formal legal power. For example, rarely does an appointed board have the authority to levy a tax to support the operation of an institution.

election

We've already made some comments on the results of election versus appointment, but let us now examine more specifically how the two processes affect each actor.

Many of the characteristics of an appointed trustee hold for an elected trustee. The elected person is just as likely to be seeking or sought after and to have basically personal or public interests in mind. Because of these similarities and because of the role of the governor and his party in the appointive and elective processes, the type of trustee selected by one method often does not differ much from a person chosen the other way.

However, the newly elected trustee himself receives the benefit of an elective office, which normally provides more power and political independence than an appointive one. The elected official has the obligation to interpret the needs and feelings of the people who elected him as his judgment dictates; the appointed trustee has a similar obligation, but he sometimes must temper his interpretation by considering the appointing authority's feelings also. Although the elected one would seem to gain more, he also pays a higher price for his trusteeship. He must withstand the financial and emotional rigors of campaigning, and in order to continue in office, he must please a majority of the voters. The appointed trustee need only please the few officials who have a say in his reappointment, and not anger very many of their support groups, in order to retain his trusteeship.

The voter receives the benefit of more direct control over the elected trustee. In the appointment situation, if a voter becomes dissatisfied with the trustee he can only bring political pressure to bear on the appointing official or vote against the official at the next election. An elected board, on the other hand, is more open to influence and thus politically less powerful groups have a better chance of having their interests represented on the board—at least by one of its members.

The greater legal and political power of the elected body often filters down through the college, giving the administrators more informal power within the community. However, balanced against this benefit is the price of discord in the management team, which is apt to arise when each elected trustee represents a different constituency. Although some social scientists feel that the public interest is best served by the bargaining and compromise that discord causes, we disagree, believing that cooperation among the board members and between the board and the administration is essential.

Having weighed the pros and cons of each type of selection procedure, we have reached the conclusion that neither one is "better" for *all* the participants. Which method is preferable depends on the perspective of the individual who is analyzing the selection processes whether he is trustee, voter, appointing official, college president, or another member of the campus community. No doubt these various viewpoints account for the differences of opinion concerning the selection process which are so prevalent in education journals. The type of analysis we've made in this article is designed to clarify the personal politics of each of the actors involved in the selection and thus to help each of them strengthen his or her political position and become a more successful participant.

Charles H. Polk is president of Daytona Beach Community College in Florida; Vaughn A. LaCombe is director of the Bureau of Educational Services and Research in the College of Education of the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; and Jeanne Goddard is a trustee of the Daytona Beach Community College District.

Who opens the door is unimportant; what counts is making sure the community college is open to all who can benefit from it.

the challenge of being a female trustee

joyce a. smith

Why would a woman want to be a board member? For many of the same reasons a man would want to be a board member, and perhaps a few additional ones. Whether elected or appointed, a trustee chooses to serve. For some, the motivation is community service or a commitment to education. For others the job fulfills ego needs, creating a feeling of accomplishment and achievement. A board member is, at least in some sense, a representative of other members of the community, yet no member can be expected to represent a collective vote or a consensus of that community. What he or she can be expected to do is learn the issues involved, make a considered judgment that seems to be in the best interest of the public he serves, and then express that judgment by vote. But consider what people often expect of women board members. They are to represent "The Woman's Viewpoint," as if all women had a single, unified stand. And they are to be heard when (and sometimes only *if*) the women's viewpoint is deemed "applicable"–for example, when the student commons is being redecorated and it is time to decide on chintz or damask draperies, or when the athletic program is up for review and the woman board member is supposed to be sure that Title IX is implemented. I believe it is important for the female trustee to be just a board member, and not The Woman Board Member. She is there to represent her constituents, men and women. Yet the adjective "woman" will be there in every introduction. Like the "woman dean" and the "woman administrator," she seems to be a deviation from a norm established by men.

A woman often does bring a different perspective to a board, especially if she has an abundance of those qualities that society has assigned to women--compassion, empathy, kindness, consideration. Nevertheless, her rewards are likely to be very similar to those of male trustees: a sense of personal development, a sense of community service, a sense of accomplishment . . . the "I can do" feeling which our society values so highly. Being an effective board member forces a person to become informed, to organize time, to listen to other opinions, and all of these actions lead to growth and satisfaction.

Another important reason for becoming a female trustee is to help other women. Many a woman who has succeeded in a male-dominated field has done so by proving she is "one of the boys." This behavior does reduce the threat to her male colleagues, who can reason, "Truly this is an *unusual* woman, an exception, and therefore including her does not open the doors to the rush of women who would follow." Such a woman, consciously or unconsciously, seeks to prove she is "not just another woman" and tries to think as men, act as men, vote as men. A related phenomenon is known as the Queen Bee, the woman who so enjoys her role as the "one woman in a million" that she puts down all women who try to compete with her to reach the same heights. Obviously, these kinds of women would not serve the interests of other women, or the interests of men either. This is why I ask the question, "Do you know a male chauvinist board when you see one?" Several of my male colleagues on the board are very sensitive to issues of human liberation. Such men are not male chauvinists. They are friends. It is important to be able to recognize your friends, whether they be men or women.

Anyone, male or female, who does not show sensitivity to human dignity; who consciously or unconsciously tends to denigrate the serious commitment of women staff members to their work and their careers; who believes that it is more appropriate for the deanship to go to a man than a woman; or who believes women applicants should be given less consideration than men in an overcrowded field "because women work because they want to, not because they have to" is a *male chauvinist.* It is also important to know the enemy, whether they are men or women. We all know women who "play dumb" when any issue of importance is discussed, who whimper that "no one pays any attention to them because they are women" and laugh off being unprepared for a budget hearing with a "But I don't understand that sort of thing." This behavior is sexist. And sexist attitudes and behavior that stereotype people, regardless of who exhibits them, are the real enemy.

Changing the stereotypes another person holds cannot be done by rhetoric. Name-calling or insisting "It's not fair!" doesn't do the job. Probably the most effective means to change attitudes is to change the person's experience. This is a slow process. If you were to ask men and women if they would want to work *for* a woman or *with* a woman, you might get a vehement "No!" together with a variety of "reasons" to back it up. Ask the same people if they have ever worked for a woman or with a woman as an equal and you would probably get the same answer. Yet if you were to ask persons who have worked with women, you would probably get a variety of answers—"Yes" and "No," just as you would if you asked the same question about men. Some men are easier to work with than other men and some women are easier to work with than other women. But men tend to be seen as having *individual differences* while women are categorized as a group.

As men and women work with and for women, they will begin to see them as individuals instead of stereotypes. Vicarious experience, such as observing role models, is also valuable. When younger women can see a female trustee who functions effectively, who assumes responsibility, and who works for needed changes and improvements in her community, they will consider these possibilities for themselves. Progress will be slow for a while. An unfortunate experience with a woman colleague will reinforce a man's stereotype. But bitchiness is not confined to women. No one person's actions reflect on all members of that sex. Women are people. I feel confident that we are no more and no less difficult to work with than other people. The best we can do is to be ourselves, confident that we do our best. We cannot, nor need we, be more than we are. The women's movement will be of age when a mediocre woman is seen in the same light as a mediocre man. Not all women board members will be terrific.

Leaving stereotypes behind, we ask the question, "How does a woman board member function effectively?" It sounds as if I just said, "Relax and be yourself," which is partly right. Add to that "Do your homework" and "Pick your battles," and the picture is complete. There is no substitute for being prepared. You must know what the issues are before you can make an informed judgment. Probably women will continue to work twice as hard as their male counterparts to be prepared and to be good role models. While there are so few female trustees, most of us are sensitive about being good ones. We will just have to live with this situation for a while. "Pick your battles" is good advice to any board member, but it is particularly helpful to women because it means knowing where the action is. In a recent article in *The American School Board Journal* (Doing, 1973) one woman board member was cited for her "stick-to-itiveness" and was quoted as being proud that she "devoted months to a problem or project delegated to her because men have wanted to move on to something else." Is she demonstrating the virtue of "stick-to-itiveness" or has she been hunting skyhooks or left-handed monkey wrenches? In another issue of the same journal (Mullins, 1972), a boardwoman claimed to have spent six hours a day, five days a week, for almost four months visiting "each teacher and classroom in our entire system of 3,000 students." Granted there may be more to these stories than is evident from reading the articles, but these women board members may not even know where the battle is. When someone starts to butter you up because "you do such a good job and have so much time," start looking around to see whether your efforts are being diverted from the important action. If you can't find the action or decide which actions are worth your time, you may wind up being a token woman and not even know it!

I care deeply about basic issues in the women's movement, yet I know that I would reduce my effectiveness greatly if I were to pick up every piece of bait. I don't really care whether I am called chairman or chairwoman. I do care that women have the same opportunities for advancement to administrative levels as their fellow professionals. I don't care who opens the door. I do want the door to the community college to be open to all who want to benefit from its programs. I don't consider it a personal favor if our administration implements Title IX. It is a law which requires the same implementation and consideration as any other state or federal regulation. I do care about good programs for all students. I care about the trend toward collective bargaining. I care about affirmative action. I care about the same things men board members care about. In short, I am a *person* concerned enough about education to *do* something I believe is important.

references

Doing, L. T. "Women on School Boards: Nine Winners Tell How They Play." *The American School Board Journal*, March 1973, p. 38.

Mullins, C. "The Plight of the Boardwoman." *The American School Board Journal*, February 1972, p. 29.

Joyce A. Smith is trustee and vice-chairperson of the Johnson County Community College in Overland Park, Kansas.

Accountability and self-evaluation must be considered a high priority by all trustees if they are concerned about their performance.

self-evaluation, key to accountability

charles h. polk
henry c. coleman, jr.

In community colleges, as well as four-year institutions, accountability is the new buzzword guaranteed to elicit a reaction. A recent response came from Florida's Department of Education, which established new accountability standards for state community college presidents. Under the provisions of that regulation, district boards of trustees are now required to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of their presidents and tell them what is expected of them at the time of contract negotiations.

Because the Daytona Beach board believes it is accountable to the citizens of its district, it was not content to be the only part of the institution not evaluated at least once a year and therefore it conducted its first yearly self-evaluation in November 1975. With the help of consultant Vaughn LaCombe of the University of Alabama College of Education, the board developed and administered its own evaluation instrument, which is shown below, along with the responses of the seven board members. The first twenty questions are a modification of a questionnaire developed by the Florida

26/27

Department of Education in a publication entitled "Performance Expectations for Responsible Community College Trustees."

self-evaluation instrument

1. I have attended at least 80 percent of regular and called meetings.
   Always 6 Often 1 Seldom ___ Never ___
2. I have actively participated in at least 80 percent of regular and called meetings.
   Always 6 Often 1 Seldom ___ Never ___
3. I have participated in board and college assignments when asked.
   Always 6 Often 1 Seldom ___ Never ___
4. I have maintained a constructive attitude toward the improvement of the college.
   Always 7 Often ___ Seldom ___ Never ___
5. I have been flexible about the acceptance of new ideas and the impact of changing times.
   Always 7 Often ___ Seldom ___ Never ___
6. I have supported the majority decisions of the board.
   Always 6 Often 1 Seldom ___ Never ___
7. I have adhered to the general structure of parliamentary procedure.
   Always 6 Often 1 Seldom ___ Never ___
8. I have attended college-related activities.
   Always 6 Often ___ Seldom 1 Never ___
9. I have participated in trustee organizations whose activities relate to my duties and responsibilities.
   Always ___ Often 2 Seldom 2 Never ___
10. I have recognized and observed my role as a policy maker and left administration to the president and staff.
    Always 7 Often ___ Seldom ___ Never ___
11. I have reviewed appropriate sources of information before decision making when possible.
    Always 5 Often 2 Seldom ___ Never ___
12. I have recognized the number one priority is the student.
    Always 5 Often 2 Seldom ___ Never ___
13. I have visited with colleagues and institutions to increase my effectiveness.
    Always 2 Often 5 Seldom ___ Never ___

14. I have exercised discretion in dealing with sensitive matters.
Always 6 Often 1 Seldom ___ Never ___

15. I have reviewed the audit.
Always 7 Often ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

16. In all decisions relating to the expenditure of monies, I have reviewed the financial reports in order to secure the maximum benefits in the most efficient manner.
Always 5 Often 2 Seldom ___ Never ___

17. I have reviewed the position of the president as a means to writing the president's contract.
Always 6 Often 1 Seldom ___ Never ___

18. I have made a continuous effort to observe the Code of Ethics.
Always 7 Often ___ Seldom ___ Never ___

19. I have evaluated my role and performance as a trustee this year as a means to become more effective next year.
Always 6 Often ___ Seldom ___ Never ___ N/A 1

20. I have kept informed on college affairs and activities.
Always 6 Often 1 Seldom ___ Never ___

21. There is a clearly written and board-approved statement of purpose for which the DBCC exists.
Yes 7 No ___ Don't Know ___

22. Written statements exist which enumerate the statutory powers, duties, and responsibilities of the board members and the board chairman.
Yes 6 No 1 Don't Know ___

23. Current written policies, consistent with statutory requirements and relating to the purpose of the college, are in existence.
Yes 7 No ___ Don't Know ___

24. A Code of Ethics has been established and adopted by the board of the DBCC.
Yes 4 No 3 Don't Know ___

25. There is a formal procedure for evaluating the impact of policy and its relevance, which includes a provision for revision.
Yes 7 No ___ Don't Know ___

26. There is a strategy for long-range planning consistent with the objectives of the DBCC.
Yes 6 No 1 Don't Know ___

27. The duties and responsibilities of the office of the president were mutually agreed upon by the president and the trustees.
Yes 7 No ___ Don't Know ___

28. Procedures have been developed which ease the period of transition when a vacancy occurs in the office of the president.
    Yes 6 No 1 Don't Know ___
29. The board bases its continuing support of the president on his execution of the mutually agreed upon duties and responsibilities of his office.
    Yes 6 No ___ Don't Know ___
30. The president solicits appropriate counsel from the members of the board in the execution of his office.
    Yes 5 No ___ Don't Know 1
31. The president's counsel to the board is appropriate when sought and/or volunteered.
    Yes 6 No ___ Don't Know ___
32. A formal evaluation of the board is conducted each year with appropriate follow-up under the general coordination of the president and the board chairman.
    Yes 4 No 2 Don't Know ___

analysis

This instrument is clearly of the very simplest type. It was designed primarily to stimulate thought among the board members, thought that should lead to a deeper, continuous program of self-assessment so that the trustees can be sure they are dealing effectively with their management problems. "In general," wrote Vaughn LaCombe, "the results represent a board that (1) understands its role, (2) takes its job seriously, (3) supports its president, and (4) is interested in the continuing development of the institution." The board members apparently agreed they were functioning at the highest level in many ways, yet they did find several flaws. They felt they could improve considerably by increasing their participation in trustee organizations whose activities relate to their own duties and responsibilities; visiting colleagues and institutions more often to increase their effectiveness; and establishing a code of ethics for the institution. (In this case the board unanimously thought it was basically ethical, but noted that a formal code of ethics had not been adopted by the board.)

Accountability and self-evaluation are not only "in," but necessary for all trustees who feel a real concern for their performance and for their relationships with their constituencies. Any policy dealing directly with a program should be assessed periodically to determine whether the program is in truth consistent with the policy. If it is not, the board should determine whether the program should be altered or the policy amended. A series of such assessments results in a continuous evaluation of programs and becomes, perhaps inadvertently, part of the board's continuous evaluation of itself. Other boards who wish to evaluate themselves are welcome to use or modify the instrument developed by the Daytona Beach Community College Board.

Henry C. Coleman, Jr., is chairperson of the board of trustees of the Daytona Beach (Florida) Community College District.

"The old dichotomy between policy making and administration no longer applies"— the board and president must be management partners, not adversaries.

building the management team

charles h. polk
vaughan a. lacombe
jeanne goddard

Relationships between boards and college presidents are beginning to parallel in many ways the adversarial relations of the faculty and administration. Lack of trust, poor communications, and the absence of role definitions characterize many of them. This situation is not inevitable, but once it exists, it contributes to the nonretention of presidents (who seem to be in short supply, if one notes the average presidential vacancy rate in American colleges and universities) and the frustrations of trustees. We believe that a consideration of several points may help to promote positive associations between college presidents and their boards and to clarify their respective roles. To facilitate the use of these points as a checklist for trustees and presidents, they are presented in the form of questions.

1. Does the board counsel its president concerning its evaluation of his operation of the college, and does the president counsel the board, providing expert advice on its policy making? The

board's major responsibility–and its most difficult–is to hire and retain a president. The best way we know to increase the amount of time between those tempestuous periods when the board is searching for a new chief executive is to establish a solid communication base. The board that counsels its president but receives no feedback or advice from him will soon become frustrated by the one-sidedness of their relationship and cease its counseling. The president who tries to advise and communicate with his board and is ignored will soon be looking for greener pastures, for the burden of operating a college soon becomes too heavy if it is not shared. Thus, if the board and president are to function as the smooth, coordinated unit they should be, they must inform each other of all actions that may affect the other. Otherwise, the communication links that bind them will weaken, one will act without the other's knowledge, and the result will be an uncoordinated effort. Enough disjointed movement will eventually cause the linkage to break completely. The result: a president resigned or fired who otherwise might have been able to work with the board. Neither boards nor presidents are mind readers; they must communicate in the normal human manner or not at all. To assume that the president or board is so expert as not to need advice and counsel could be fatal.

2. Do the president and board view themselves as adversaries or partners? There is no room for adversary activities in board/president relations. The old dichotomy between policy making and administration no longer applies (if it ever did) either in theory or practice. Any attempt to draw a rigid line between them only interferes with the partnership in management. Though the president may be an administrator, he is also the board's agent for achieving its goals and carrying out its policy. And the board oversees and evaluates the president's execution of these policies and plans. Thus, board members are in reality part of the management team and presidents take part in making policy. For both parties the primary benefit of this partnership in management is its stimulating effect on communication. No longer does the president feel compelled to hide information from the board; neither does the board have to "pull eye teeth" to discover what is happening at the institution with which it is entrusted. When communication is open, boards retain presidents.

3. Are presidents, boards, and individual trustees aware of their proper respective roles? Some overlap of the functions of the board and president is necessary if they are to counsel each other

and be joint managers. At the same time, the president, board, and individual trustees must understand their separate roles. Individual trustees must realize that, although they are entitled to great respect, courtesy, and appreciation as a result of their position as members of the board, individually they have no formal authority except that specifically given them by board by-laws or statutes. Only as a combined board do they govern the institution.

Boards make policy, presidents implement it. A thin, gray line exists between these two functions, the misunderstanding of which causes most of the grief that boards and presidents experience. The unhappiness arises because the parties do not understand their own or the other's function and because they fail to recognize that the line is thin and gray, not thick and black.

4. Is the board seen as a "rubber stamp"? Boards are sometimes seen as mechanical bodies which knowingly or unknowingly delegate most or all of their power to their president and then publicly grant *pro forma* approval to the president's every "request." Not only does this practice amount to an abdication of trust and responsibility, an act tantamount to malfeasance, misfeasance, or nonfeasance, but it also can lead to further management errors. The board may circumvent the president and establish direct communication with other board employees to somehow "buy back" a degree of the respectability it has lost by its irresponsible delegation of authority and responsibility to the president. All the board really gains by this circumvention is an employee who no longer is, or feels himself to be, totally responsible to the chief executive officer of the institution. If the president is to be held responsible for the entire operation of the college, he must be able to have the employees he hires feel completely responsible to him. When the board does not fulfill its obligations, it is hampering the president in his execution of his now greatly increased tasks. When no one is willing, or able, to assume responsibility for the entire operation of the institution, its overall efficiency and effectiveness are bound to suffer. The antidote for this institutional poison is a healthy exercise by the board and president of their respective powers.

5. Are trustees really involved in the institution? There are some functions that are more appropriate for trustees than for the president to perform. But to be done well, these tasks require trustees who are committed and involved. An example is representing the college in the federal and state legislative chambers. Because trustees are appointed or elected, they are political actors,

and thus they are particularly well suited to handle this job. In our political system, the individual or organization is expected to protect its own interests; no one else will do it for them. If legislators hear nothing from an institution, they assume that the institution agrees with their positions. Involved trustees can approach legislators and "let them know different."

6. Do trustees and presidents share a common objective in their public relations efforts on behalf of the institution? It is appropriate and natural for both board members and the president to do public relations work, but they should agree on a common purpose, one that we believe must revolve around and ultimately benefit the students, for it is for them that the college exists. Therefore, board and president must share an institutional perspective rather than view their P.R. efforts as benefiting the faculty, administration, or other employees. Once consensus is reached, they can work in complementary ways.

7. Is there any mistrust between board and president? If there is, the chances are a destructive adversarial relationship is imminent. The key to building trust is communicating and counseling; boards must not be kept in the dark and presidents must be counseled. The president has many opportunities to keep the board and its individual members informed of the operation of the institution and to indicate issues on which policy study and action are needed. Perhaps the most formal way is by placing items on the board's agenda for meetings. In communicating with the board, the president should understand the difference between providing information on college operations, abdicating his administrative decision-making responsibilities, presenting policy alternatives to them for their decision, and dictating policy decisions to the board. When he is describing his execution of board policy, he is not presenting administrative problems to them for their decision. When the board is making policy determinations, he sits with them as an expert advisor, not as a decision-maker.

The board also has many opportunities to counsel with their president concerning his management of the college. Certainly most of this can take place informally, but we also favor a formal, public counseling and evaluation of the president by the board at least once a year. This meeting sets a tone of openness and accountability in this post-Watergate era and lessens public mistrust as well as mistrust between president and board.

8. Do the board and president allow the board's political

nature to cause problems in their relationship or do they use it to advance the institution? The advantages must be taken and the problems neutralized if the board and president are to function as a team. The most significant benefit is the willingness of a board to use its political clout to make things happen for the college. However, this advantage is only latent unless the board will function in this manner and unless the president exercises educational leadership in coordinating the application of this political power.

The most significant drawback of the board's political nature is the possibility of its being "captured" by special groups, such as faculty unions, student organizations, or community influentials; or of its knuckling under to demands from such groups for special benefits that are not in the best interest of the institution. Boards are political to ensure their responsiveness to the entire community's needs, so by nature they can mobilize countervailing forces to prevent special groups from forcing their demands on them. A politically astute president can advise his board in this regard. Here, once again, we want to emphasize the importance of communication and counseling between president and board. This is the best way of keeping their relations strong and cooperative instead of weak and adversarial.

9. Does the president keep his board fully aware of trends in education? Part of the president's responsibility is to act as the trustees' primary educational advisor. For example, he should explore with them the concept of the "new" faculty member and the "new" student so that they can make enlightened decisions.

Having reviewed nine issues which influence the working relationship between the president and the board, we now return to our main theme. To increase the effectiveness of the presidents and thereby retain him, and to prevent the board from becoming frustrated, board/president relations must not be adversarial. Instead, they must be strong and cooperative partners in management. If they understand and carry out their distinctly separate roles, if they communicate and counsel with each other where their responsibilities overlap, they are well on the way to having an effective team.

Reasons for throwing out written policies and creating an atmosphere conducive to strong and innovative personal management.

policy development

b. a. jensen

"And God created organization and gave it Dominion over Man." That's the Genesis I, Title 3, Subchapter 280A, Subparagraph VII as published quietly in the Federal Register—"Policies and Management: The Trustees' View."

Now that I have your attention, let me ask a question. How many of you would prefer to manage a college without a formal set of written policies? My college president has already had two heart attacks, and if we were ever so unfortunate as to have him succumb to another one, I'd like to head a list of candidates with those who had sufficient confidence in their own managerial talents to be willing to throw off the stifling shackles of written policy—in the form to which it has degenerated today.

Let me describe one such set of policies, the handbook of my institution. It is a loose-leaf compendium, almost two inches of assorted wisdom (nonsense), restrictions, and restatements of the laws of Iowa. It was produced at a tremendous cost in trustee, administrative, and faculty time. There is not one iota of humor or friendliness in any of its pages, so it's no fun at all. It is supposed to solve all college management problems and is considered by some to be a model set of policies. It is used most frequently by members of the staff who are strict with words. They are most often heard to say, "It can't be done, it's not in the written policy." These kinds of people are readily identified by their singular lack of new ideas and unwillingness to listen to the ideas of others!

My lack of affection for written policy was not always so. I once was a baptized, confirmed believer, one who often tried to show trustees that they were just not quite apostolic if they didn't write it down and set it aside. In 1952, I listened to the persuasive sales pitch of a policy handbook salesman and he did a marvelous job of showing an Iowa school board just how far behind we were by not having a policy handbook. He pointed out that the transition from the educational backwoods would be quick, and painless, too—because his publisher just happened to have a set of basic policies which would be an excellent starter for us, and he would be happy to sell it to us. He asked only one thing on our part—it was almost nothing—just send them a copy of every *new* policy we developed or any revision of the originals. After all, we would really be helping other less far-sighted boards by contributing to their policy handbooks. I'm told his publisher made a pot full of money before they finally went belly up. My status as a believer lasted until I began to see written policies become almost totally alike all over the country. Management inbreeding seemed to be the cause, and those of you who are students of genetics know what kind of offspring result from too much inbreeding.

Written policy today is the outgrowth of discussion by administrators looking for new tools of management—ways to keep nosey faculty and probing trustees at bay, ways to even out the bumps and ruts along the road to administrative heaven. All very laudible aims, but the policy was implemented too often for the sake of the system rather than for management results. The results are absolutely frightening. We are smothered by a huge shell of oversimplified rules and regulations which tend to stifle every new management thought which is expressed by good administrators.

But all is not lost. The teacher unions just love written policy. The more detail, the better they like it. It is a perfect organ for hog-tying and restricting management in the collective bargaining process. It puts presidents and trustees in a management vise from which they cannot escape, and the vise will be tightened by each negotiation. If you doubt this, then try putting out the word that you intend to dump your policies. You'll get reaction, and quickly!

Having confined my remarks almost exclusively to policy, I'd like to say a few things about what management can be like without the tight wrap of written policy as it exists today. First of all, it's important to reaffirm that we are talking about the management of a community college—a phenomenon hardly old enough to be ranked as an institution. It is an educational situation which changes, or should change, continuously, a situation in which we can and must deal with the future every day. The college can help to provide the "good life" for an increasing number of people if only we remain pragmatic, instead of becoming altruistic; humble, instead of omnipotent and unapproachable.

Successful management of the community college must surely begin and end with a deep and abiding concern for, and knowledge of, the people who will be served—an understanding of the broad diversity of background and yearnings of the students, and a sincere desire to help them achieve their aspirations. What I have in mind is a management which counts its successes in terms of individual achievement, rather than just counting F.T.E. increases and measuring budget expansion.

I believe good management begins with picking the right top man and then adopting something like the simple statement of responsibility which guides the trustees of Harvard University: "Our responsibility is to see that the institution is well run, and not to run it." If the trustees can pick the right man and let him run it, and if the president can run it and keep his board well enough informed that they will let him run it, then both president and board will have discharged a major portion of their responsibility and have laid strong foundations for a successful management effort. With that kind of foundation, most of the policy handbook can be tossed out. I look at this management business as a team undertaking, but the kudos for it should go to the president. Of course the president, if he is smart, will probably pass it down to his staff and faculty if he wants it to continue.

What kind of a person is this right kind of president? Really you just can't tell by looking at him. He comes in assorted sizes and shapes—with or without hair, with or without a doctor's degree, but always with a large measure of understanding of the individual and his needs. He is never without compassion. Probably he is not a great scholar in the truest sense because he would not have had time to develop into that form of stagnation. He does not have a pat answer to all the managerial problems of the day because he realizes there are already too many educational orthodoxies imposed on people. He may very well appear to be different, which is another way of saying he knows the value of being somewhat bureaucratically maladjusted. He has a peculiar ability to pick out winners who want to win. He points out the mission and then creates an atmosphere where those winners can achieve his goals without the president's having to do their work for them. He is willing to let them make mistakes and has the ability to point out how their errors can be turned into future success.

This right kind of president has an abundance of confidence in his ability to manage, but doesn't let it hang on his sleeve. He understands finance, the use and leverage of money, and he probably is considered a tightwad by those who believe in the "ask and it shall be given" method of allocation. By the same token he may be considered okay by those who espouse the "prove it and I'll find it" method. This president is probably a fun-loving person because he is first of all a very human being, but he believes in performance and I mean excellent performance. He's the sort who can say to a subordinate, "If you can't do it excellently, don't do it at all, because if it isn't excellent, it won't produce fun; and if it won't do that, what the hell are you doing here?"

What I've described is almost a "fly by the seat of his pants" manager, a man who doesn't want his job overdescribed for him by a set of policies written years ago by people much less capable than he is. If this right kind of management specialist is hired, what's left for the trustees to do? The answer is not a cop-out for them—a big job remains. The board has not only to provide the platform from which this man can manage but to keep it in good repair, because there are many who will tear it down, some out of ignorance, some out of slothfulness, some out of malice, such as the AFT and the NEA.

The difference between negotiating with the building trades, as I have for twenty-five years, and negotiating with teacher unions is this: after I've received sufficient raving and cursing and insults from bricklayers or teamsters, we finally arrive at an adjustment for the next year, and they go back to work. They don't *want* to run my business. The reverse is true for the teachers. They have stated publicly that their aim is to make the policies first, and the salaries will follow automatically.

The board's job is a big one. It involves a new word—*militancy*. It involves a continuing fight at local, state, and national levels to preserve not just the management platform but the whole wonderful concept of education called the community college.

Trustees are probably not really very well prepared to do this job when they first come on their boards. However, they can do something about it. They can attend conferences and seminars and conventions, expose themselves to the ideas of other trustees. But a word of caution: they would do well to act like kids in a candy store which hands out samples, tasting a bit of everything but not buying it all. They can probably make some just as good when they get home.

If I've come on strangely and strong, it's not a mistake. If I have projected the thought that management by personal style, by personality and flair, is more important than management by the numbers, then I have made the points I intended to make. In this overbureaucratized society of ours, we desperately need outstanding individual leadership if we are to escape the waves of conforming mediocrity. I, for one, am willing and eager to defend my position against the jeers of those who can't stand the refreshing breezes of new and changing ideas.

I challenge you to start a revolution in management. Throw out your written policies and instead adopt some goals for the institution you serve. Change your top manager, your president—and I don't mean fire him, except in the rarest of circumstances. I mean give him the platform from which to operate. Create an atmosphere which is conducive to strong and innovative personal management. If he's worth his salt, and he probably is, he will surprise you with his blossoming. If he doesn't, then it's time perhaps to discuss where and how changes must take place, either a new president or a new board.

You've got a good thing going for you. You're on the board because you want to be, because you want to serve, or at least you should want to. If not, then both you and your college have a problem. If you want to serve and are willing to learn more about that service, if you are willing to understand your role as a board member, willing to let your president manage and hold him accountable for the management, then we can look to the future of your college and mine and like what we see.

B. A. Jensen is a trustee of Kirkwood Community College in Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

As students, faculty members, and the public bring more suits, trustees must become aware of potential legal problems and secure competent legal advice.

the law and the board

george e. potter

Few things are more important in managing a college than understanding how the law affects its governance. One reason is that our complex society seems to require more and more laws to regulate the actions of its members. Another is that a growing number of people are resorting to the courts to redress their grievances, as is evident from the considerable publicity given to the increase in litigation and the crammed court dockets. A third factor is the tendency of courts today to become legislative bodies. The law in America is based on the English system of common law in which the courts develop legal principles to deal with the problems of society. As new problems arise, new principles are developed; but the old principles remain part of the common law and are followed by the courts. The legal term for the latter is *stare decises* or precedent. It was generally the rule that once precedent was established, the courts followed it and left it up to the people or the legislatures to enact statutes or constitutional amendments in derogation of the common law. However, in recent years the courts have grown impatient with the legislative bodies and are overruling common law principles all the time. Principles that have been established for hundreds of years are suddenly no longer guiding our society.

All three of these factors are making a knowledge of the law more important than it has ever been in the history of education. Every year literally dozens of laws are introduced in state legislatures which directly or indirectly affect colleges and universities. Every year more citizens, more students, and more faculty members are seeking to redress their grievances in court. It seems that students and faculty members see a violation of constitutional rights in every action of an administration or a board with which they disagree. It seems that citizens in general are no longer likely to accept the actions of their government without challenge. So although educators need not necessarily become lawyers, they should at least gain a working knowledge of educational law and learn to recognize potential legal problems before they develop into actual litigation.

student litigation

Suits brought by students greatly outnumber those brought by faculty members and members of the public. They are challenging rules governing speakers on campus, the distribution of literature, the solicitation of funds, and on campus demonstrations, as well as rules requiring living and eating in college facilities. Suits have been brought by females insisting on their right to participate in male athletic programs or demanding the development of a broad range of female athletic programs. Nonresident tuition charges have been challenged as a result of both the eighteen-year-old vote and the increasing use of eighteen years as the age of majority. This last issue probably will not be as important in the community college movement because most of our students live within our districts. But for those institutions that have dorms or have a great number of nonresident (out-of-district) students, this is a potential legal problem. We may reach the point where all students will be local residents.

Surprisingly, students have also sued over disruptions on campus which interfered with the educational process. They have sought injunctions against curtailing classes because of disruption, and in a couple of instances, students have tried to get refunds of tuition because they didn't get what they paid for. Unfortunately for the students, the courts have tended to rule against them in the latter cases, but only because their education was interrupted only briefly. If the disruption is more than brief, the college may have to make such refunds.

The denial of academic degrees is another subject of litigation. In one case the court found that the student had been led down the primrose path because administrators had made him think he was on proper course toward receiving a degree, but when he had completed two years (in a community college), he was denied the degree because he hadn't conformed to all the requirements. However, the courts have generally upheld colleges' denial of degrees if there has been any reasonable basis for the denial.

A great many lawsuits have concerned the regulation of student newspapers—censorship, dismissal of editors, refusal of an administration to allow them to accept certain ads, a college's attempt to convert the newspaper to an instructional tool. If student funds are used, particularly funds allocated for student activities, then little control may be exerted over the student newspaper. That's clear from the various court decisions.

There has been litigation over discontinuing food services, not recognizing student organizations, and not allowing students of one sex to enter a college limited to the opposite sex. Students have sued for damages resulting from injuries sustained while in school, and from disclosure of confidential information. They have sued because of searches of their cars, their lockers, or their persons by school authorities. And dress codes are being challenged right and left.

The courts have not been uniform in their holdings in these cases. They have, in fact, ruled differently in different states and in different federal districts. However, there seems to be a common thread running through all the decisions: boards and administrators have comprehensive authority, consistent with fundamental constitutional safeguards, to prescribe and control conduct in schools. Further, they have the responsibility to control and regulate whatever behavior of students tends to impede, obstruct, or threaten the institution's educational goals.

However, their authority over the students, while comprehensive, is not absolute. Rules regulating speakers, distributions of materials, and so forth, are permissible, but they must be reasonable and not violate the student's constitutional rights. The criteria for allowing or denying a request must be specific. An expeditious review procedure must be available in the event the request is denied. Finally, although disciplinary action against students is an inherent right of an institution, due process must be followed at all times. What constitutes due process varies with the severity of the disciplinary action. If a student is given a lengthy suspension or is expelled, he must have a hearing, an opportunity to confront witnesses and be represented by counsel, and a right to introduce evidence on his own behalf.

The best advice is to follow what we have done on our own campus and what most other community colleges are doing: repeal your dress codes, repeal your regulations on the distribution of literature and on speakers, and be hard-nosed on those things that count. On our campus, disruption of a speaker's talk, disruption of the educational process, or carrying firearms means immediate expulsion. There is no compromise. However, we do not regulate what students wear, what they do off campus, or their advocacy of political views. We feel that a free exchange of ideas must be carried out on a college campus.

One of our rules has been particularly effective. Any student who is convicted of violating the law while on campus is automatically expelled without further hearing. Students have cried that this action puts them in double jeopardy. But punishing them in a college administrative proceeding as well as in a court does not create double jeopardy. Due process is observed by the court, and the due process requirements of a college proceeding are much less stringent than those of a criminal proceeding. Consequently, we have taken the position that the student is not going to get two hearings. Expulsion doesn't preclude readmission, depending on the nature of the offense.

Following student disruptions, a rash of laws were passed by state legislatures regulating conduct on campus. And of course, every state has trespass laws. Both of these kinds of laws have useful purposes, but they are quite technical, so if you think you might have occasion to invoke them, insist that your administrators become acquainted with them. Many cases have been lost not because the law wasn't being violated, but because the administrators were not acquainted with its technical requirements.

faculty litigation

Of the cases recently filed by faculty members, more than 90 percent have involved dismissal—outright firing, failure to rehire probationary teachers, compulsory retirement, and other actions that resulted in the teacher's loss of a job. The law on these issues is not very clear. If they have tenure, of course, you have to establish good cause, and even if they don't have tenure, you may have to establish good cause. If they're on probation, you generally don't need good cause to dismiss them.

These and other kinds of legal problems with teachers are definitely on the rise. The reason is simply that more and more states are enacting public employee collective bargaining laws. These require public employers to recognize any union whose members form a majority of the employees within a certain bargaining unit; the employer must sit down and bargain in good faith with the union and, if agreement is reached, enter into a labor contract. These acts traditionally are modeled after the National Labor Relations Act and contain the following elements: (1) they affirm the right of employees to join labor organizations; (2) they specify election proceedings for the determination of an exclusive bargaining representative for an appropriate unit; (3) they require the employer to bargain in good faith; (4) they prohibit interference or discrimination by the employer because of union activities; (5) they provide the employee, and sometimes the employer, with remedies for unfair labor practices; and (6) most prohibit strikes.

Already we have had suits to determine what constitutes a strike. A New York court said that a mass resignation is a strike. A New Jersey court held that a blacklisting of a school district by the NEA constitutes a strike. In Michigan, although it is illegal to strike, the Supreme Court said that it would not allow an injunction ordering the teachers back to work unless the school could show irreparable harm to the public. Consequently, most courts in Michigan have been reluctant to enjoin strikes.

State labor relations acts set up several methods for resolving conflict. Strikers may be punished through voluntary or mandatory sanctions by the employer, but frankly, both of these measures have been notably unsuccessful. Some states are allowing a limited strike, a strike by public employees whose work does not involve public safety. They recognize that prohibitions against strikes just haven't worked. Labor relations acts also provide for handling conflicts with "bargaining aids." Mediation occurs when a state-appointed mediator comes in and tries to resolve the dispute between two parties. Settlement is entirely voluntary. Another aid is called fact finding. It involves the appointment of a supposedly disinterested person by the state labor board who comes in, takes testimony, receives evidence, and then finds facts, rendering his findings in some sort of impartial judicial atmosphere. Generally the result is an attempt to compromise the two positions rather than an objective finding on "facts." A third bargaining aid, compulsory arbitration, isn't required by most state acts, except possibly for cases involving policemen, firemen, prison guards, and similar employees.

Prepare yourself to deal with unions. If your state has a public employee relations act requiring you to recognize and bargain with employees' unions in good faith, then I suggest that you acquaint yourself with the law in this area.

other parties seeking litigation

Although taxpayers have shown less inclination to sue the government than students or faculty members, there have recently been several taxpayer suits questioning the validity of millages and bond issues. And there has been a rash of suits lately by the news media demanding information relating to employees' salaries, student organizations, and the like. Courts generally have held that information on salaries, fringe benefits, hours of work, and similar matters is public and must be disclosed. Exclusion of the public from the campus is the subject of several cases. Some of these have arisen when nonstudents came on campus and were charged with trespass violations. In other instances, rules keeping the public off some campuses have been challenged. Another interesting case concerned segregation. A Virginia federal court blocked the conversion of a community college to a four-year institution, finding that the change was proposed solely to allow the college to compete with a previously all-black public college (4-year) nearby.

In summary, public litigation, that is, suits brought by members of the public other than students and teachers, has not been common in recent court history and is unlikely to increase very much. What is going to increase a great deal in the near future is faculty litigation and, specifically, cases arising from collective bargaining with employees.

recommendations

First, learn to recognize potential legal problems and even anticipate statutes and regulations which might affect your operation. In other words, set up a sort of an early warning system and become as competent as you can on the subject, but don't consider yourself as good as a lawyer. Many trustees have gotten into trouble because they didn't consult a lawyer. The law is not black and white, it is very gray, and it is not an exact science, but an art.

Second, employ competent counsel. Make sure that the rules and policies that your board intends to adopt are first examined by your lawyer. Generally, it's best to employ a firm rather than a single attorney. The legal profession continues to have its head in the sand, pretending that all lawyers are able to handle all kinds of law, but you don't have to accept such nonsense! This profession is as specialized as medicine, and one practitioner cannot be competent in all fields. If you have a one- or two-man firm that is presently representing your college and doing a fine job, continue to use it. However, you may get into specialized matters, like labor issues. At that point, insist that your firm recommend an associate who is expert on that subject. Hiring competent counsel will save you money in the long run.

Finally, don't think that what happens in the courts is all-important. The statutes enacted by your state legislature and by Congress, and the rules and regulations adopted by your various state and federal agencies, will have a greater bearing on your institution than court decisions. You can win an inning in court and lose the whole ballgame in the legislature. So organize effectively on the state level. Sharpen your political skills. Don't hesitate to lobby in the legislature, Congress, and the various state and federal agencies.

If you develop a working knowledge of the law, employ and use competent counsel, and do your homework in the legislature and agencies, then you'll generally avoid legal problems. If you do none of these things, you're headed for disaster and you'd better budget a good share of your funds for legal expenses to get you out of the troubles you are going to be in.

A case study analysis of the effects of stress on the members of one board's bargaining team.

preparing for collective bargaining

richard a. gardiner

In January 1969, the Community College of Philadelphia (CCP) entered into collective bargaining with Local #2026 of the AFT, and a year later the institution's first master contract with its faculty was ratified. Since similar actions are taking place with increasing regularity around the country, I think it is enlightening to look at their causes. At CCP, unionization seemed to be the result of shift from a liberal arts emphasis to a comprehensive community college orientation and a corresponding change in administrative style.

At its inception in 1965, the college was generally perceived by administrators and faculty alike as an institution for teaching the liberal arts. But apparently, preparation for and the actual experience of a 1967 Middle States Association accreditation effort directed the attention of administrators and trustees to this liberal arts bias, and they subsequently decided that the concept of a comprehensive community college was more suited to their rapidly growing institution. Believing this change to be an entirely legitimate step in the college's development, they moved strongly to implement it between 1967 and 1969. Simultaneously, what seemed to have been a collegial relationship with the faculty was

52/53

eroded when the board and president became increasingly firm in their commitment to this educational principle. Whereas the faculty had had autonomy and the freedom to make decisions at the departmental level, they now perceived a move toward centralized decision-making. They resented what they regarded as an invasion of their professional rights and responsibilities—to which they had been comfortably accustomed. Accordingly, as administrative leadership became firmer, so too did faculty resistance. By 1969, their positions were polarized, and only two specific issues—the department head issue and the October 15 moratorium—were needed to catalyze the formation of the union.

Serving at the time as the assistant to the president for personnel relations, I was the president's representative at the table for the final seven months of the negotiations. The board's chief negotiator was a professor at a local university school of business and a widely experienced public school negotiator. He was assisted by a prominent Philadelphia labor relations attorney both skilled and experienced in private sector negotiations. The board team was completed by the CCP business manager and a number of temporary members drawn from the top echelon of the college administration.

By the time negotiations began, the college had more than six thousand students, approximately two hundred faculty and staff members, and a board of trustees appointed by law by the mayor of Philadelphia. The nature of the trustees' involvement in the bargaining experience can be summarized as follows. At some point, an assumption was made—or was at least allowed to evolve operationally—that the bargaining would be handled largely by the administration, using hired professional negotiators. The board's participation would be minimal until a crisis should occur or the final contract was ready for approval. Thus, all preparation and planning was done only by administrators and professional negotiators, while the Board was "kept informed."

The minutes of the proceedings demonstrated this approach, showing heavy board involvement when the first strike was threatened in March 1970 and when each of the three actual strikes occurred in September, October, and December of that year. By contrast, the first two drafts of the board position that were presented at the bargaining table had been produced by the professional negotiators in consultation with the administration and had never been approved by the board in either substance or concept.

After the negotiations were over, I felt it was important to analyze the effect of this pattern of board involvement on the decisions that were made by the board, administrators, and professional negotiators during the bargaining period, especially because in many instances the decision-making process was characterized by a great deal of stress, tension and disharmony. And CCP administrators alleged that these conditions had a negative effect on the substance of the decisions reached and ultimately on the contract itself.

To examine this pattern, I used a case study approach and a modified social systems analysis. The trustees, administrators, and external agents (the professional negotiators and the legal advisor) were conceptualized as exclusive and discreet components of a system which received *inputs* from the faculty federation in the form of demands, acted on these demands by *converting* them to decisions, issued these decisions as *outputs* which in turn served as *feedback* to the federation, triggering new demands/*inputs*, and so on. My analysis of the operation concentrated on eight significant conversion decisions, which were subjected to two questions: How was the final decision reached? And who influenced whom in making it?

The criteria for selecting these eight decisions evolved directly from the events which transpired during the negotiations. Specifically, four critical situations involving threatened or actual strikes were documented. They were viewed as critical because in each instance the normal functioning of the institution was directly affected by and contingent upon the outcome of the board/administration conversion of faculty demands to outputs. At no other points in the bargaining process were institutional operations thus threatened.

In each of these four situations there was an easily discernible pair of key conversion decisions by the board and administration. The *confrontation decision* was the one which when expressed as output provoked a strike or the threat of one. The *resolution decision*, expressed as output, settled the confrontation—in one case it averted a strike and in the other three it settled a strike already in progress. A brief description of the substance of these four critical situations will be helpful as background.

Critical Situation A (unit determination) involved the basic issue of whether department heads were to be included in the bargaining unit. The faculty organization adamantly demanded their inclusion, and the board/administration team just as adamantly opposed it. The faculty organization threatened a strike unless their position was upheld. A compromise agreement averted the strike.

Critical Situation B (the art aide issue) centered on the faculty group's contention that an art aide whose service had been terminated by the administration on the grounds of reorganization prerogatives had been unfairly treated and should be reinstated. The administration refused, citing its managerial right to reorganize the college. The faculty organization called a meeting for the morning on the day the college was scheduled to open. The board/administration then refused to open the college. The beginning of the fall semester was thus delayed by some three weeks as a result of the first strike by the faculty union. Agreement was later reached by both parties before a judge in chambers.

Critical Situation C (the second strike), according to the faculty organization, was caused by the absence of movement by the board team on substantive issues, a contention bitterly disputed by the latter. This strike lasted only one day and was again resolved by agreement of both parties before a judge in chambers.

Critical Situation D (the third strike) again involved the alleged absence of significant movement by either team according to the other. An important new element in this strike was the fact that by virtue of the second agreement before the judge, the college was legally unable to secure an injunction, and the strike itself appeared legal under Pennsylvania Act 195. This strike was settled some six weeks later when the master contract was signed by both parties.

My analysis of the decisions made by the board team revealed that in each of the four situations the team members were unified in their views leading toward and their support of the confrontation decision. But in deliberations before the resolution decisions, conducted as they were under pressure, a highly stressful polarization developed between the administrators and the external agents, and the board was forced to choose between them. The pattern is exemplified in the following discussion of the substance of the resolution decisions.

In Situation A (March), the professional negotiators were successful in persuading the board to compromise its confrontation decision by agreeing to negotiate the duties of department heads in a separate "side-bar" session. The administration was never persuaded, but its objections were to no avail. Situation B (September) saw the professional negotiators again successful. They persuaded the board to reinstate the art aide, giving her a "suspended service" status with full pay; her complaint was eventually to be settled via the negotiated grievance procedure. The administration never agreed with this resolution and fought vehemently against it. Ultimately, the board-approved resolution was actually reached by the legal counsel before a judge in chambers and apparently without further discussion with the board or the administration even though the situation was entirely different at that point because of the newly initiated student injunction proceedings which brought the parties to court.

The resolution of Situation C occurred when the legal counsel and one professional negotiator agreed, again before the judge in chambers and as a result of another requested injunction, to compress the time period required by P.L. 195 for the use of impasse-reducing mechanisms. They also agreed to waive the college's right to seek an injunction against a strike under the "clear and present danger" provision of the law in return for a faculty return to work. This agreement rendered a strike by the faculty, should one occur after the agreed-upon time period had expired, entirely legal; it also rendered the college legally powerless to stop such a strike. This resolution decision was reached unilaterally by external agents, again with no apparent authorization from or communication with the board or the administration.

The resolution decision in Situation D was made when the professional negotiators were successful in persuading the board to ratify the contract again over the continuing objections of the administration.

Additionally, the analysis indicated that the influence of the external agents was not limited to resolution decisions. Increasingly, as the bargaining wore on, the president and his chief administrators saw their positions and recommendations disregarded by the board in favor of actions supported by the external agents. In the final two months, this pattern was evident even in relation to the crucial matter of bargaining latitudes, that is, what subjects were negotiable or mentionable and how far the negotiating team could move to effect settlement. Again in these cases, the negotiators presented their views and recommendations, the administration objected and presented counter-proposals, and the board followed the negotiators' recommendations.

conclusions

All evidence points to the inescapable conclusion that control of the decision-making process in the board/administration team was gradually and imperceptibly assumed unintentionally by the external agents. As a result, the major critical decisions, although authorized *de jure* by the board, were actually reached *de facto* by the external agents. This unintentional assumption of control over the decision making that was the major cause of stress among the three constituencies, although the situation was not clearly understood at the time. All the administrators involved in the proceedings sensed that something was amiss, but none could precisely identify the problem because of such close and emotional involvement.

The stress seems to have been created as follows. By extracting bargaining latitude from first the administration and then the board, the external agents evidently threatened the institutional status quo even more than the collective bargaining itself. Their capacity to threaten is probably explainable by the fact that they actually did link the board and administration directly to the bargaining table. In any event, the administrators characteristically tried to protect their coveted positions and became increasingly mistrustful and resentful of the external agents, while the lay trustees were placed in the uncomfortable position of having to choose between the two.

As we have seen, this pattern of decision-making became entrenched and it reinforced the generation of stress. Every time the professional negotiators were successful in influencing the board, the administrators' resolve to resist the next attempt to erode their prerogatives and positions stiffened and resentment increased. The tragic fact is that both were motivated by a perfectly defensible rationale: the administration sought to protect the institution; the external agents had to have bargaining latitude to attain compromise and reach settlement.

There were several reasons for the lay board's consistent support of the external agents. First, supremacy in oratory and persuasion clearly belonged to the professional negotiators, one a skilled and articulate labor relations lawyer, the other a polished and urbane college professor. Here was definitely a case of "no contest." Second, the trustees, many of whom had been associated with the college since its creation, were laudably committed to the education of the CCP students. Most important, however, the board's response was directly affected by the ad hoc, crisis-oriented nature of its participation in the negotiations. There is no evidence that systematic planning and preparation, involving trustees, administrators, and external agents, ever occurred. This is not surprising, given the board's inexperience and the many demands on their time. It is accurate to state that throughout the proceedings the trustees were directly involved only during periods of crisis.

As a result, then, of this lack of preparation as well as a keen sensitivity to its responsibility to keep the college in operation, the lay board, besieged by the external pressure surrounding strikes, student sit-ins, court injunctions and appearances, and the dissatisfaction of the mayor and councilmen, was most vulnerable to the oratorical and persuasive skills of its negotiators.

Following completion of the negotiations, I was quite tempted to oversimplify and state that the stress and its causes, both personal and situational, had had a negative effect on the contract, rendering it far more liberal and institutionally damaging than it would have been otherwise. Indeed, this was generally the administrative view following contract ratification. However, the available evidence does not sustain such a conclusion. Other than conjecture there is no basis for comparison, because no positional agreements existed other than those negotiated. It would be equally inaccurate, however, to suggest that the decision-making process was not adversely affected by the stressful conditions.

During collective bargaining, as Howe (1973, p. 17) suggests, the board and the administration ideally should agree on substantive positions, bargaining limits, and the like, so that the board team may meet the challenge to the institution as effectively as possible. Clearly, in the CCP experience, harmonious relations between the trustees and the administrators existed for the most part only in reaching confrontation decisions. When it came to resolutions, the administration was openly abandoned by its board. To suggest that this absence of support was received by the administrators even passively is absurd. Early frustration turned to perceivable bitterness as the bargaining drew to a close. And these feelings prevented the effective use of their intelligence and insight. A defensive self-protective stance and a stressful atmosphere are seldom conducive to creative problem solving and decision making.

With regard to relations between the board members and the external agents, it is likely that their decisions were also affected to some extent by the stress situation. Although the substantive decisions might have been the same, the effects of oratorical skill and persuasion might have been less had adequate planning, preparation, and discussion replaced the ad hoc, crisis approach to board participation. In general, then, stress in the authority system resulted in part from the nature of the trustees' involvement and negatively influenced the decision-making process in that it closed off some of the human resources among the administrators and perhaps the board members, resources which certainly would have been helpful in responding to the challenge of collective bargaining.

reference

Howe, R. *The Community College Board of Trustees and Negotiations with Faculty*. Washington: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and Association of Community College Trustees, 1973.

Richard A. Gardiner is vice-president for development at Mount Alosius Junior College in Cresson, Pennsylvania.

Effective board members understand and are involved in politics at all governmental levels.

trustees, lobbying, and legislators

walter b. calvert

Just as our education as trustees does not begin as we enter our building doors, neither does it end as we leave our respective board meetings, because continuing education is an important ingredient in our continued success. One of our "required courses" should be on political knowledge and involvement. We will be more effective if we understand and appreciate the efforts of various politicians and lobbyists and learn to work with legislators at all governmental levels. The media do not always bring out the actual story of these efforts because they are concerned with presenting sensational news. For example, one newspaper I know used to publish a running report on the number of minutes the legislature was in session each day, which led people to believe that legislators only work during the actual sessions. The truth, of course, is that they spend many long hours outside the chambers attending meetings of all types and doing research. Even the hours in caucus are a very necessary part of the legislative process. It is just as ridiculous to say a legislator works only when he is in session as it is to say a teacher works just in class, or the clergyman when he preaches Sunday morning, or the newspaperman while the presses are rolling.

Now what about lobbyists. Lobbyists are people, they are human beings and they are citizens. In Wisconsin, by law, all lobbyists are registered and they represent only legitimate businesses and professions. As authorities in their respective fields, lobbyists are necessary, because a legislator cannot possibly be an expert on everything. When he has more than two thousand bills to consider each session, he cannot possibly be well informed on all of them.

After your faith has been restored in your duly elected representatives and your lobbyists, establish rapport and keep in touch with them. Write to them often and express your opinions, but better still, personally contact them and express your views. Attend the public hearings which are held for all significant bills and make your views known. If it is not possible to do that, register for or against the pending bills. If the legislator from your district is on the committee, he is glad to have you attend the hearings and hear your presentation, as well as to ask your opinions. He, of course, might also like to give you his views. Finally, after the vote is taken, even if your legislator did not vote the way you thought he should, judge his value as a legislator on his whole record, not on one or two bills.

Do not overstress the so-called roll calls of legislators. Sometimes a newspaper or a special interest group obtains the roll calls on a few bills and rates the lawmakers according to the way they voted on bills that the group thinks are important. I believe that a voting record on ten to twenty bills out of two thousand is not necessarily a reliable test. What one person or group considers important might, in the opinion of another group, be against the general public interest, which is what the legislator must consider.

I realize it is more difficult to contact and meet with your congressional representatives. But the trustee has an effective executive director in Washington, and when he makes a personal contact, you are effectively able to exert pressure on your representatives.

Invite your local state legislators to meet with your groups and associations. Invite them to your schools. Show them your buildings and what you are doing. Tell them what the students are doing and where they end up. Tell them not only of the training but of the retraining you are giving in order to keep up with changing technology in industry. Describe your outreach programs that are providing quality part-time adult education to thousands of residents statewide.

In summary, let me briefly list a few do's and don'ts that can help trustees be effective in working with state and federal legislators. To be successful, do the following:

1. Know your representatives, both state and federal.
2. Organize your efforts. You have the Association of Community College Trustees and Association of Vocational, Technical Institutes.
3. Meet as associations and agree to support, oppose, or to take no action on pending legislation.
4. Select and organize an active legislative committee within your association.
5. Hire a lobbyist if possible.
6. Contact your local legislators; if all of your districts do this, you are effectively covering the entire field of representation.
7. Give most of your effort to the important issues instead of trying to cover all of them.
8. Work with other lobby groups in addition to your own association, such as the Association of School Boards, other education groups, and labor organizations. (No single group has done any more for the success of vocational education in Wisconsin than the labor unions.)
9. Personal contacts are the most effective method to use in working with legislators.

To be successful, do not do the following:

1. Write long laborious letters to your representatives.
2. Be a parrot and use the same language your executive secretary or lobbyist has used.
3. Flood the legislature with mimeographed material.
4. Write disgruntled or uncomplimentary letters.
5. Fail to write a thank-you note to the legislator for passing or showing support for a bill you favor.
6. Make a nuisance of yourself with the legislator or legislature.

Remember this fact: most legislators wish to support the positions of the majority of their constituency. If each district wishes to be effective, its members must all be active in this process, and the more participants who are not vocational, technical, or community college employees, the better. Become involved—you can accomplish much in these efforts.

Walter B. Calvert is a trustee of the Southwest Wisconsin Vocational-Technical Institute in Fennimore.

The basic methods for bringing financial stability out of chaos.

a hard look at finance

fred l. mathews

Financial Crisis! is apt to be the headline when educational institutions are discussed today. But this phrase would be more accurate if it read, *Trustees Create Financial Crisis*, because there is often little relationship between an alleged crisis and the dollars per pupil available to run an institution. In fact, the problem colleges are often those who have lived high, spent lavishly, and neglected productivity and accountability from the top down. I place the blame on trustees because the buck stops there. As trustees, we are the ones ultimately responsible for the financial health of our institutions.

During the past decade, almost any college could survive financially, even with mediocre management. Money problems were solved by increasing enrollments, more state aid each year, new federal dollars, higher tuition, new and higher tax levies. Politicians, the public, and students passively accepted this kind of solution as the crusade for "Quality Education" became synonymous with more and more money. But no more! The public now realizes that, within reason, little relationship exists between "quality education" and the dollars available. The excesses of the sixties have brought state governments and the federal government near the breaking point so that these revenue sources are diminishing. Students will no longer pay higher and higher tuition. And new millage assessments have as much chance of passing at the polls as the proverbial snowball in Hades. All is not lost, however. We can, if we have the will, emerge from the financial crisis of the mid-seventies and end this decade stronger fiscally and stronger educationally than ever before. Those of us who have been looked upon with some apprehension for applying hard-nosed business principles to education, during the years when this was not popular, have been vindicated and now find a listening audience for our views.

As I said, a sound financial condition begins with the board. Gone are the days when the public could afford to have a trustee selected solely because he or she balanced a board racially, ethnically, by sex, by age, or any of these artificial criteria. Today the trustee must be able to read a balance sheet, understand finance, and be willing to make the hard, but sound business decisions necessary for a balanced and logical budget. I hasten to add that these requirements do not necessarily rule out the minorities, the women, or the young, because all these groups do have many qualified members.

To build a board with the necessary skills and determination to govern this big business—and it is a big business—the trustees must first evaluate themselves to see whether changes within the board are needed. Those without the expertise or the will to govern should be politely asked to resign. Then the board must evaluate its president. Does he have the capabilities to carry out sound board policies and objectives consistent with available revenues? The president must in turn evaluate his administrative staff to determine whether they are in tune with the board's policies and with his methods for carrying out those policies. This hard evaluation, from top to bottom, in an institution with financial problems, will probably result in some significant staff and board changes. During this revitalization and reorganization, the board must also develop long- and short-range goals and objectives for the institution. It is hard to determine the cost of a trip without a map showing where you are going.

Once this shake-up is over and a competent board, president, and staff are hard at work, it is time to develop the budget. With the right staff and well-developed policies, the board need only say to the president, "Bring us a balanced budget." It must be the president, not the board, who now referees all the academic wrestling that goes on inside the institution at budget time. A board involved at this time will create chaos. But when the balanced budget is ready, the board must scrutinize it carefully. By the way, an operating budget which uses any nonrecurring income to balance it is really a deficit budget. The use of surpluses, reserves, unusual gifts or grants to balance an operating budget has brought many colleges, two or three years hence, to financial crisis.

To be meaningful, the proposed budget must be extremely detailed. It must be broken down by departments and must show what was spent last year and what is proposed this year in each category. A review by the trustees cannot be meaningful without this comparison. Projected income must be examined carefully. In 1975 many colleges based their budgets on the belief that all of the state's budget would be funded. They thus refused to face the reality that declining state revenues would cut support for all units of government, including the community colleges. Those institutions are now in deep trouble.

Once this budget review is completed (it should be done in a couple of hours if the president has done his job well), the board adopts the budget. Then the president and his administrative staff must have the freedom to spend what has been budgeted without undue constraints but must also be expected to live within its limits. A board should not waste its time deciding which brand of typewriter to buy, which make of furniture, and so on. Yet expenditures must be consistent with a sound purchasing policy.

At least quarterly the board should get a budget analysis from the business office showing the amount budgeted in each category, the amount spent, and the balance in each account. This document will help the board and administration prevent overspending in a critical account before the year is over. Adjustments in a budget category are more easily made before the money is all gone.

We now have the ingredients for a smoothly running institution. In my observations of community colleges over the past eleven years, I have found that a board with the talent and discipline to get its financial house in order will almost always display the same discipline in increasing productivity, accountability, and service to its community, so that true quality education is provided. And I am convinced that with determination, most institutions with financial problems can, by following these general guidelines, turn financial crisis into financial stability.

Fred L. Mathews is chairman of the board of trustees of Southwestern Michigan College in Dowagiac.

After visiting the board meetings of nineteen
Southern California community colleges,
the author suggests some successful procedures.

secrets of a board chairman

margaret c. k. gibbs

Now that my title, like the cover of a pulp magazine, has enticed you to read further, I cannot guarantee you'll find out all you need to know, but I can at least share the trade secrets of managing successful board meetings. I learned them during a recent freeway cruise of southern California when I observed the meetings of those trustees who govern nineteen of the state's ninety-nine community colleges. Admittedly this was only a small sample, but it was all I had time to study in two months of summer. The colleges I visited ranged in size from a small rural institution with five hundred students to a metropolitan school with several campuses and an enrollment of more than one hundred thousand. The smallest budget was six million dollars, and presidential salaries were from $32,000 to $45,000.

The impetus for the trip was twofold. I wanted to satisfy my curiosity about how other boards operate, and most of all I wanted to find out whether certain charges that have been made regarding community college governance are true. For instance, James W. Guthrie of the University of California recently stated that laymen have lost control of the schools, which are now run by educational professionals. Sheer growth accounts for part of this loss. With the reorganization and reduction in the number of school districts, trustees may now represent from three thousand to a million constituents. Furthermore, in recent decades schools have been organized, at least at the administrative level, like businesses; the trustees serve as the directors of the corporation, allowed only to set policy, hire the chief executive, and pass the ready-made budget.

William Danforth, chancellor of Washington University in St. Louis, says, "As we are all aware, public confidence in higher education has waned for a variety of reasons." He suggests that "those who care about higher education have an obligation to be informed and to respond." If we do not do so, the "focus of decision-making may be pushed away from individual campuses, further from faculty and campus-based administrators" toward centralized authorities, presumably state and federal. "Bureaucracy and bigness have . . . reduced the potency of public policy makers." Guthrie furthermore emphasizes that neither parents nor teachers can really make their suggestions effective without action by the emasculated trustees. Less and less attention is paid by trustees to the education being offered by these professional managers, who also control the business operations of the community college.

What struck me most during my travels was the distinctive personality of each board and the disappointingly similar lack of initiative. Each board has a mood, a timing, a decorum, as well as a procedure distinct from any other, but most of them follow a pattern of acquiescence to a prepared agenda of legal busywork, with a docility born as much of apathy as of trust in their administrators. No evidence of hard thinking was found. Considering that all California public school officials operate under a detailed state code and the famous Brown Act (and I want to digress a little here to quote its beautiful preamble from Section 54950 of the Government Code: "The people of this state do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. The people in delegating authority do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people insist on remaining informed so they may retain control over the instruments they have created"), one might think trustees were all alike. But they are not; in age they are from twenty-one years to more than eighty, and in profession they vary widely indeed. I observed university administrators, lawyers, financial vice-presidents, retired professors, insurance executives, salesmen, engineers, morticians, dairy owners, elementary teachers, community college teachers, university teachers, ministers, savings and loan operators, milling and feed company owners, real estate brokers, dentists, physicians, utility executives, veterinarians, restaurateurs, police lieutenants, certified public accountants, cattlemen and ranchers, retired persons, and those hardworking, underpaid servants, housewives. Moreover, it seemed to me that they were not even very representative of their constituencies, the majority being WASPs and electably middle-class. Most gave little evidence of any concern or imagination with educational policy, merely responding like prototype "Yes" men and women. One board had an agenda instructing them how to vote, and two others had a staff recommendation on the disposition of each item. Maybe part of the problem is a scarcity of women members; the five I saw (out of 101 trustees) in each instance asked stimulating, even penetrating questions, and perhaps that is why one-third of the nation's superintendents do not want any women on their board, as recently reported in the press.

Although every board saluted the flag, only a few included an invocation, though several gave clear indication of needing all the help they can get, divine or otherwise. Two boards served light refreshments, coffee, lemonade, and cookies. One had both an Indian and a black nonvoting appointee who sat with the board and commented freely on the business, particularly any items which related to ethnic groups.

While there were press representatives at several trustee meetings (which is one secret for community acceptance), citizen attendance was so limited that at each college I aroused enough curiosity by my note-taking to be asked why I was there. At all but one meeting I was publicly identified as a fellow trustee, an introduction which seemed to relieve some tension. I had telephoned ahead to each to discover meeting times (4 and 7:30 p.m. are the most common hours) and to secure agendas, partly because I wanted to find out if these were prepared and circulated in advance. Most of the trustees came with homework prepared, but some had not yet read their packets of materials and other boards received their agendas at the table *after* they arrived. Meeting rooms varied from a table in the corner of the entrance to the superintendent's office to elaborate walnut-panelled, handsomely carpeted chambers, complete with executive rocking chairs.

At some sessions the staff members were sprinkled among the trustees, making a form sheet of the players necessary. Other places seated the trustees and staff separately, a procedure I grew to prefer because it is otherwise very difficult for a visitor to identify the policy makers, even if they rarely function in that capacity. Trustee participation varied greatly. One man said nothing except "aye" on the votes, others had numerous questions and comments. This pattern seemed to be a group phenomenon. Where one member asked good questions, others did. Where one was silent, all were silent. Vocal contributions by the chancellor, president, or superintendent ranged from rare occasional explanations to a steady stream of interjections, advice, argument, support, explanation, and justification. One superintendent spoke only once in a three hour session to answer a question. At the opposite end of the spectrum, one president very nearly ran the entire meeting, presiding from his chair, while the chairman merely inquired plaintively, "All those in favor?"

Staff members, especially business managers, tended to be wary of trustees and somewhat defensive, giving less than adequate answers, that is, not erroneous, but less than complete replies which necessitated further questioning. Most of the agenda items transacted were routine and business-oriented–approval of bids and trips, attendance transfers, purchases, student store and cafeteria matters, employee retirements and replacements–and these usually came first in the meeting. Four colleges actually listed sections entitled "Educational Planning and Development," or "Instruction," or "Curriculum and Instruction," or "Academic Affairs," but at only one school did I hear any discussion on educational policy and that was on MBO (management by objectives). Most courses and book lists were approved by title, as code requires. Nowhere did I hear any references to ideas expressed in recent articles, books, lectures, reports in the press, or elsewhere, about educational matters, references that might have reflected some feeling of responsibility for the educational mission. Only one trustee questioned courses dropped or added, even though as my economist husband points out, "Horseshoe-nail mills deserve to fail," and some courses surely might be reexamined with an eye to current suitability.

Some budgets were given only the most casual attention, whereas others had been studied line by line over a span of six months of preparation and adjustment. The most thoughtful trustees whom I saw in action were quizzing academic department heads about their priorities, goals, and progress, while each defended his decision to expend "x" dollars on one item or another.

The multiplicity of detailed financial reports prepared on behalf of the board, or received but rarely considered or questioned by them, gives one the impression that someone is checking up on the effectiveness of teaching and programs, but this seems to be illusory, notwithstanding California's Stull Act. Most of the reports actually just state where the pennies went, showing that they were spent in accordance with budgets and programs, whereas any measure of *effectiveness* must be included at the time of budget preparation or when program money is applied for, that is, built in to the proposal, not determined post-transaction. And the measure should be an audit by an independent person, not an evaluation by the group or program itself, as it is in some MBO systems. The many reports required by state, county, and federal funding agencies perhaps give trustees the feeling that their initiative is being restricted even more than does the administrative code. What other factors contribute to a reduction of their proper authority, I do not know.

Because time does not allow further detailed review of my visits, let us turn to the "secrets" which may prove useful to all of us. (I trust you can judge when I am serious.)

Secret #1: An inconvenient meeting time such as 8 a.m. will guarantee you no visitors; likewise a long executive session in the early or middle part of the meeting is an effective crowd dispeller, as is putting hot topics or business from the floor at the end of a long agenda. (Meetings, whether monthly or semi-monthly, are not movable feasts, as it says in the prayer book, and the schedule should be set and announced well in advance and thereafter adhered to.)

Secret #2: Failure to identify trustees, employees, students, and the press and a lack of name plates will so confuse the audience that you may escape by a rear door while an irate citizen is berating the custodian, mistaking him for the chairman of the board. (Booklets "Introducing Your Board" or even a single sheet of identifications would be helpful and a good public relations investment.)

Secret #3: Whether you choose a chairman by seniority on the board, by the greatest number of votes cast, or in rotation among the members as my board does, try to find one who knows little of parliamentary procedure and doesn't believe in it. This characteristic will enable a knowledgeable speaker to tie the meeting up for an hour while amendments to amendments are offered, and votes called for before discussions can begin. The chairman can do more to gum up the works by announcing his own position before the discussion starts and by freezing that stand for the rest of the board. (Keeping the situation fluid offers opportunities to reach some accommodation.)

Secret #4: Keep copies of the agenda to a minimum so that there is none for the audience. If you cannot avoid distributing them, then refer to all items in code, such as "Resolution #9781, Purchase Order 8845, employee increase Step 8, Column 10," which will confound the spectators and enable you to vote on almost anything without explanation. (Agendas should be prepared, distributed, and studied in advance and discussed in public. Their format should be such as to be easily followed; colored sheets between sections or page tabs help. Private rather than public discussions with staff members may lead to your being accused of prejudicial arrangements or support. The agenda is your second most important management tool, the budget is the first.)

Secret #5: Add controversial items to the agenda too late to be published and thereby keep the public in the dark about what time to show up at your session. The press will appreciate this reduction of their work load (remember the Brown Act!).

Secret #6: If your board likes to finish its meeting quickly, use a consent agenda and you'll never even have to read the material. "I move items forty-seven to ninety-eight do pass" will catch the audience off guard before they can protest. (Although consent agendas may be of some use to a very large organization with many routine items, they also constitute a great hazard in allowing matters which should be examined to slip through unnoticed.)

Secret #7: "No objection" motions also enable the chairman to speed up a session. These require no second and permit any member who cares to, to make a motion to discuss his favorite topic even though not even one other person wants to listen. (Take time for a second and his motion may die aborning.)

Secret #8: Remember from your own school days that the administrator is always right and follow his lead, even around the mulberry bush. Never mind that you were elected by the citizens who have entrusted you with watching their interests and those of their children and that you are ultimately responsible to the electorate, not to the superintendent or president or even the board. (Disagreement over ideas is not necessarily bad and may be essential before a board can reach consensus. Growth results from change and evolution. Board unity is really only essential in crisis situations, where if you don't hang together you may hang separately. Other times it may represent only board inertia.)

Secret #9: Be generous with the speakers who appear before you whether they be staff members or citizens or trustees. This latitude will enable you as the chairman to rest while the conversation wanders and the public quits paying attention. If you are extremely clever, before they awaken you may slip through a vote on the matter which got buried in the verbiage. (It may be policy to operate this way, but more likely it is poor presiding. Especially when controversial items are due for discussion, it is well to set procedural ground rules at the beginning, including the time allotted to each speaker, lest you work till the dawn's early light. And it's not a bad idea to note down the speaker's name, which is required for the minutes, when he begins, rather than struggle for it as he finishes: "Thank you, Mr. uh-uh-uh." Don't waste time on trifles. "De minimis no curat praetor.")

Secret #10: Be informal–refer to everyone by his first name and kid him along, relax and chew your gum, lounge on the table and rock your chair and regard the ceiling carefully to give the appearance of thoughtful consideration while you calculate your own bank balance or what to do about Junior. Be personal in arguing with the speaker. All this will make the audience feel at home. (No board chairman is ever too courteous, just as it has been said that no woman is ever too thin or too rich. Punctilious courtesy to all not only is the hallmark of good manners, but is infinitely valuable for quieting complaints and quelling riots. A gentle sense of humor helps, too, as a circuit breaker for tension, but don't try to be funny in public. Nothing can be more misunderstood.)

Secret #11: Don't let the public hear you. Whisper among yourselves, avoid the public address system, or let it stay broken, pronounce and enunciate carelessly, and speak through your fingers or hand. As the current book by James Boren says, "When in doubt, mumble." (Insist that your P.A. system work, or speak up.)

Secret #12: When the time comes to vote, have the clerk call only the names of the trustees in the room. If one or two members of a larger board of seven or nine have gone out for a smoke, they won't even be missed,

Secret #13: Pass the budget as presented. Who are you to question it? (Only the bosses. Budgets are marvelous secret hiding places. It is possible to split salaries, or other costs, among departments or functions so you can never locate all five-fifths of an employee. It is possible to transfer reserves and general funds about, an action which requires much time and effort to trace. It is considered kosher in administrative circles to earmark large amounts for exigencies and apply them to favorite projects during the year. Computers can now be blamed for all unintelligible reports. If you don't, or cannot, follow your budget and monthly financial reports, fire the computer. Spend enough time on the budget detail to learn for sure where your money goes.)

Secret #14: Hold as many executive sessions as possible; they are more peaceful. (Avoid executive sessions whenever you can. They can lead to lawsuits, even though pending suits are one excuse to hold them. Right now the board of one of the California colleges is involved in a taxpayers' suit because of a secret meeting.)

Now about administration; it is fair, and in this paper I am assuming that every college has an ideal administrator. I am not here to discuss executive qualities or management talents, but our job as trustees does include a firm hand on the reins of administration. Which brings me to Secret #15: Engage all the assistants you can to help your administrator. After all, having ten deans for a 5,000-member student body creates more jobs, even though your neighboring school has only five deans for the same number of students. In every administrator is at least a trace of monarchial blood, and empire building is as natural as breathing. (Just keep your eyes on who is moving up to bonus paychecks. Titles do not come cheap.)

Secret #16: Assume all administrators are just teachers grown tall and pay them accordingly. If the faculty is getting a 10 percent cost-of-living increase, the president deserves it, too, although 10 percent of his wages may cost your district $3,000 or $4,000, not to mention expenses for his car, mileage, travel, and other perquisites of office. (More and more districts are learning to separate teaching and executive pay schedules. Bread costs the same whether you make $15,000 in the classroom or $40,000 in the front office.)

Staff members know secrets too. A favorite one is to snow you with paperwork. Dozens of reports will make the staff look busy, and distract and divert you from asking any really important questions. One of the best and highest executives in the film industry circulates monthly routing slips on all communications, which require the employees to show what decisions they have made based on each report they received. (Try it, you'll like it!) Another secretarial secret of possible serious consequence is to record only the *votes* in the minutes, so that discussion, consensus, or disposition without a vote might as well never have taken place. (Personally, I like tape recorders, which get it all accurately. In your official capacity in a public meeting, you shouldn't be saying anything that doesn't bear recording.)

In conclusion I must say that I also observed good techniques, such as:

- Putting "student reports" and "hearings for delegations of citizens" on the agenda right after roll call. After all, what is our business but students? Furthermore, a board cannot accomplish much if the audience is buzzing like a nest of angry hornets.
- Treating all policy decisions like city council ordinances—that is, giving them a first reading but not voting on them until their second appearance on the agenda. This procedure saves many a poor decision and considerable embarrassing backing up.
- Using a separate sheet of paper for each agenda item and listing on it the disposition, vote, names of trustees making the motion and the second, and who is responsible for carrying it out. This tends to prevent items from "falling through the cracks."
- Offering trustees a monthly listing of all reports in progress that they have requested, giving the date initiated, the anticipated completion date, and the name of the person preparing them. This action also prevents lost items.
- Giving background information on each business item on the agenda: why it is there and what its "budget implications" are.
- Beginning budget study early (November) and giving at least three-months to it before passage. The budget is one of the few critical controls the trustees wield.

Margaret C. K. Gibbs is a trustee of Citrus Community College in Azusa, California.

The role of the chairman and his special relationship with the president are discussed, as well as recommendations for handling public criticism and the media.

governance relationships and tasks

donald a. seifert

All the persons who are responsible for governing a community college have special roles and relationships with each other. The chairman of the board (or "chairperson," if you prefer) is not identical with his (or her) colleagues, and his association with the college president is unique. Likewise, the other trustees have less intimate but nevertheless important relationships with the president. Here I want to describe briefly some of these differences, from the standpoint of one who is a trustee but not a chairman, and examine two of the most delicate tasks undertaken by both board and president: handling college critics and working with the news media.

The chairman is responsible for directing and somewhat controlling board discussions and must therefore exhibit a light touch or a firm hand, whichever is necessary. With tactful use of his authority, decisions can be implemented and board business conducted in an expeditious manner. But the chairman should not take all powers on himself and should make judicious use of his authority to appoint committees. Groups concerned with personal matters, labor negotiations, long-range planning and finance, for instance, can be very helpful in saving discussion time and making use of the interests and skills of individual board members. This type of involvement benefits the individual trustee as well as the board as a whole. Committee actions and recommendations should, of course, be reported to the full board.

Because community college boards are usually small, I feel that the appointment of an executive committee is usually not desirable. It dilutes the board's effectiveness because all the trustees do not benefit from the full discussion of matters that normally come before such a committee. Although I seem to be vacillating in my support of committee structure, I think the executive committee is different from all the others.

The chairman should not take a proprietary attitude toward the institution because of his authority and sometimes unique knowledge of college activities. It may require considerable forbearance in some cases for the chairman to resist such attitudes, because pride in the institution as well as pride in his contributions to its success are natural. And the chairman should work diligently to prevent the development of polarization or cliques among the members. However, frank differences of opinion are a healthy sign that the trustees are capable of independent thinking and should not be viewed with great alarm.

How should we choose this leader? He should be considered a leader in the eyes of the community, one who has good contact with his constituents. But the chairman should not be just a prominent name—he should be willing and able to work at the job, realizing that demands on his time must be accepted and his best efforts must be available. The chairman should be receptive to change and not be too satisfied with the status quo. Above all, he should be interested, enthusiastic, and aware of the college's activities. Thus, I do not support the concept of a rotating chairmanship because I believe the most qualified member should hold the position until the board feels that a better qualified person is at hand and is willing to accept these responsibilities.

All the trustees who are not chairman must realize that the relationship between the college president and the chairman is unique. There should be closer contact and understanding between these two, who share the greater responsibility for the success of the institution, than would be expected between other board members and the president. Because boards cannot be convened at any time, given the professional and personal demands on the trustees' time, the president must have direct access to the chairman for his council and support when urgent administrative discussions must be held or interpretations of policy must be made. Some board members may understandably feel left out if they are not sufficiently informed of significant decisions made or actions taken under such conditions. But through tactful communication with the entire board at an appropriate time, the chairman should be able to clear up any difficulties.

When the call for help is given, the chairman should decide whether the issue is one of policy or administration; if the latter, he should allow the president to resolve the issue as best he can and support the administrative actions taken. Communication is the key to a close working relationship. All the necessary information should be provided for review by the chairman, who should, in turn, provide the full board with this information as soon as possible. In some cases, a telephone poll of available board members is a necessity.

Like the chairman, the other trustees should support their president publicly and emphatically. By strengthening his authority and improving his image before the community, faculty, staff, and students, the trustees will also be defending their good judgment in selecting him. The president should be helped to grow in his job, and this assistance should include a frank evaluation from time to time. The evaluation should be discussed with the president and he should be given the opportunity to respond as he sees fit. The president's weaknesses should be made up by board strengths, just as his abilities complement those of the trustees. The president must be allowed to hire a staff that will enable him to delegate work and give him time to deal with the larger issues.

Trustees should guard against dabbling in administration. The board must set policy, but also must allow the president to administer the policy. I don't advocate ignoring the faculty and staff, but care should be taken to maintain the president's position and to channel issues requiring board action through the president's office.

The board should provide opportunities for the community to become acquainted with the president. Organizations and clubs should be encouraged to ask him to speak at their meetings and to join their ranks as he finds time to do so. Trustees could invite the president and his spouse to attend parties and gatherings of friends whenever it suits them individually. The closeness of the friendship between a trustee and the president should be a personal matter, since the employer-employee relationship will continue to exist.

handling the college critic

Community college trustees should welcome constructive criticism, but dealing with open, public hostility is another matter. When the critic is a legislator, his position as an elected public servant and representative clothes him with authority and poses considerable difficulty to the board. The board members gain little comfort from the fact that they are also (usually) elected to their positions and thus accountable to their constituents.

The president should bear the brunt of attacks on the credibility of the college. Even though the board and president may be considerably provoked by such criticism, restraint should be exercised in public retort. An unfounded minor attack may be ignored, because dignifying such an assault with rebuttal affords the antagonist more chances to gain publicity, which may be the underlying reason for his action. But if there is some basis to a charge, whether minor or major, it should be met with fact, carefully researched and fully explained. Any misrepresentation or error in the response will present a further opportunity to discredit the college.

In one way, critical charges by the public or by an elected official may have a positive effect by causing closer scrutiny and knowledge of what the college is doing. The trustees should be prepared to be accountable for the performance of the college, for the kind and quality of its service to the public, as well as its expenditures and fiscal management. If its house is in order, and proper audits and complete records are open to the public, the college may benefit from an increased awareness of what it is providing to the community.

working with the media

The news media are very influential in shaping the public image of the college. They create the community's attitude toward the institution and directly affect the sense of self-worth of the academic community. Reporters should be encouraged to attend all public board meetings. If nonpublic meetings of the board are allowed, these should be kept to a bare minimum, and careful consideration should be given to allowing media representatives to be present. If an understanding can be reached that the reporters will only gather background information at nonpublic meetings, it is possible that confidentiality can be maintained. Try it—remember, what is secret is suspect.

Public information personnel on the college staff are a necessity. The news media should be well supplied with releases about college activities. These save reporters time in obtaining the information and researching the facts. The media appear to be in constant need of items to fill space or time, and these spots might just as well be occupied with news of the college.

Some cautions should be observed in working with the news media:

1. Don't only tell them what you are doing tell them why you are doing it.

2. Public relations staff members are vital, but the president should also be available for interviews.

3. Important news releases can be timed so that one medium does not get too large a jump on another. For instance, if the newspaper hits the street at 3:00 p.m., radio and TV should not get the release before noon.

4. Get the facts straight. Once you are in print, errors are forever on record, it seems. Retractions often are ineffective.

5. Avoid involving the college in controversial issues that have no bearing on the role or goal of your services.

6. Try not to hire employees or ex-employees of local media. The salary ranges at your college may be higher than those of the media, causing hard feelings.

The college's purpose and commitment must be repeatedly brought to the attention of the community. Even long-established institutions must bring the attention of the public to their plans for new programs and concepts, so that support can be generated. Good relations with the news media may not allow shortcomings to go unreported, but may help in obtaining a fair appraisal of the situation.

We trustees come clothed with authority, responsibility, and, sometimes, respect; but we must be prepared to deal with the naked truth.

Donald A. Seifert is a trustee of Muskegon Community College in Michigan.

A look at the pinch caused by an increasing demand for services and decreasing resources, with emphasis on the experience of West Valley Community College in Saratoga.

the enrollment crisis in california

mildred h. wharton

What is the "enrollment crisis" in the California community college system? What causes it? Does it have both positive and negative consequences? Is it really not one but a series of complex crises? We cannot answer these questions without concurrently analyzing the "funding crisis," for the two are inseparable. We know that the percentage of increase in student enrollment in community colleges has been double that of the four-year institutions. Yet some two-year colleges are actually hurting because in numerous instances the rapid increase has tended to destroy what took years to build. In essence, we have here a paradox. Some of the basic factors involved, as I see them, are:

1. *The method of funding in California* (SB 90 and SB 6), where state funds are redistributed from high-wealth districts to the less well off ones. The intent is to raise up the poorer districts, but the real effect is mediocrity for all. The poorer districts must indeed be assisted, but not at the expense of their neighbors who have over the years established superior educational programs (many of them through their own tax increase). Tax reform in educational funding is drastically overdue.

84/85

2. *The current economic situation* with its high rate of unemployment. Many persons are returning to school to learn new job skills, to refresh or upgrade themselves, or just to have something to do that is worthwhile, rewarding, and enjoyable.

3. *The shift in social values* and the concurrent belief in continuing education.

4. *The demise of the draft.* The fact that students no longer have to take a full load to maintain their deferment is one of the few factors tending to lower the ADA (Average Daily Attendance).

5. *Inflation.* The rising costs of necessities, as well as luxuries and recreation, are inducing some people to return to school for some relief from frustration (and it's a healthy relief!).

6. *The "mission" of the California community college system* to assess the needs of its communities and to serve those needs, coupled with the "open door" policy. Thus, the more we fulfill this defined purpose, the more students and state aid we get, because the state bases its financial aid computations on ADA figures.

7. *The immigration of people to California*, especially to Santa Clara County, which is one of the fastest growing counties in all the United States.

8. *The recent statute making eighteen the age of legality*, which both generates and promotes greater population mobility.

9. *The emphasis on senior citizens.* People are retiring earlier, living longer, having more leisure time, desiring more from life. No longer are many of them content to sit in a rocking chair and watch the rest of the world, in which once they had a vital part, go by without them.

10. *The effect of women in and on education.* Some of the women who are reentering the educational field now have never finished high school or even entered high school before. Others are members of a large group of middle-class and upper-middle-class women who, after raising their children, want to do something to keep themselves interested in life and so return to school to work toward a degree or to develop a rewarding skill with which they may or may not earn money. Then there are many working mothers who must support families and need to learn a skill, change careers, or upgrade whatever abilities they have.

11. *The overall negative reaction of the taxpayer* to almost any tax increase. That reaction is especially strong when the tax is one they can control directly. Although their short-term thinking is understandable, it's unfortunate that they seldom compare the cost

of educating a student (roughly $1200 a year) and the cost of maintaining a juvenile delinquent (which averages about $12,000 per year, nationally). They are also failing to consider the effects of their attitude on the cost of inflation in construction and equipment and labor. At my college, the first proposed bond issue in 1964 for a complete campus was $16 million with a $.65 tax including all overrides. Now, after four bond failures, the nearly completed campus is costing $27 million without all the same features, and the tax rate has fluctuated in the past five years between $.939 and $.888 (1970-75). This year, though the general operating tax is actually down, the total tax fund is $1.077 because a second campus is being built. In addition, the land for the first campus averaged $12,500 per acre, whereas the land for the new campus is $25,000 per acre.

12. *The effect of education on social mobility.* People are recognizing John Kenneth Galbraith's theory that schooling is the basic means for moving up in class. Though a number of critics are questioning this assumption, especially the claim that higher education is a financial bargain, it is still true that an investment in education, assessed both quantitatively and qualitatively, comes very close to being the basic index of social progress. A graffitti thought: "Education is expensive, but try ignorance!"

13. *The 5 percent student enrollment "cap."* The California legislature recently passed a law under which the state will provide its portion of the funding for a 5 percent increase in enrollment and no more. Even now, however, there is some movement to redefine this law, since it has produced inequities that were not initially considered.

14. *The opportunity for juniors and seniors in high school to take courses in the community college* for credit, if they have satisfied all the requirements for graduation at their particular school or if they wish to take a course that is not given at their school. This provision, of course, is geared to the bright, active student.

15. *The right to take a high school proficiency test.* Another new California law permits sixteen- and seventeen-year-olds, with their parents' permission and the payment of ten dollars, to earn a certificate of accomplishment and leave high school by passing a test. According to its promoters, this bill enables the "bright, bored student" to enter the world of work or attend college. However, work is not that easy to come by these days even for adults, and I don't believe the unions will take these youths until they are eigh-

teen. So the majority will enter the community college despite "the cap," or end up on the streets, and the local property taxpayer will have to foot the additional bill for educating, or caring for, these young people if their numbers increase with any significance over the years.

16. *Affirmative action recruitment.* As one faculty member succinctly put it at a recent board meeting: "Several years ago, we were told to go out and recruit ethnic minorities, women, the economically disadvantaged, and senior citizens. We did. And as we know, success does not bloom overnight." Now, these efforts are not only blossoming, but bearing fruit! Result? Increased enrollment!

Whether this crisis (or these crises) is resolved in a positive or negative way depends a great deal on how we as board members see our roles. In a recent educational publication, I read this pertinent question: Do our structures determine our goals, or do our goals determine our structures? One way or another, the trustees' activity, or lack of it, has a tremendous effect on the handling of the enrollment problem.

At the Pacific Seminar of the Association of Community College Trustees in Honolulu last year, I was asked to speak about what the newspapers have termed the "phenomenal growth" of West Valley Community College (a 26 percent districtwide increase). West Valley has always been a college in transition. The district was formed in 1963 and we began to operate in 1964 in a vacated elementary school building with thirty-two hundred students. In 1968, we moved to the new Saratoga Campus with one permanent building for Engineering-Tech and one portable for the Food Services Program. Today, the Saratoga Campus is virtually complete. In 1974, some twenty thousand students walked through the registration lines, and in 1975, that number increased to some twenty-four thousand. We are now the twenty-third largest community college in California. The new Mission Campus in Santa Clara should be ready for partial occupancy by the fall of 1978. (In September 1975 we established a temporary campus in Santa Clara in another vacated school building; this one had been closed because of the new method of state funding.)

All of this growth has not been without accompanying pains. Though our student enrollment was constantly increasing, the percentages of increase each year were expectedly decreasing—until, about four years ago, a strong upsurge began. So we have experienced both birth and rebirth. In spite of the near completion of the Saratoga Campus, we are still using every portable on the temporary campus in Campbell. We shuttle students back and forth from one location to the other. The parking at Saratoga overflows into passage lanes and onto neighboring streets despite traffic tickets. The immediate neighborhood is, understandably, not too happy about this situation.

We have had to build on a "pay-as-you-go" basis. This method has some advantages, but it is hard on the current taxpayer, who has to pay for everything now instead of being able to extend the costs over future years and share them with those who are continually using the facilities. Had it not been for state matching funds, derived from several junior college construction acts, and federal loans and grants for construction and equipment, we would not have our campus today. However, this method of funding was the choice of the electorate.

It has also been an uphill battle to overcome the antipathy of local schools to the community college concept. Some counselors, teachers, and parents still see the "junior college" as being lower in quality and status than the four-year institutions. We have also been in stiff competition with the four-year colleges and universities for additional state support.

Despite these attitudes, demand is high, as I have already shown. Last year, during registration, we lost some two thousand students, in part because they were unable to get into the classes they wanted or needed. An example is the RN Refresher Program, which has had a waiting list for two years. So actually, we have only scratched the surface in serving those who want what the community college offers. In the southern end of the district, where the Saratoga Campus is located, we serve 1 in 12 students; in the northern end, 1 in 70. However, our new Mission Campus should reduce the latter ratio.

In researching the subject of growth, I interviewed persons within the college community, faculty and classified staff members, counselors, administrators, students, other board members. A great deal of like-thinking was found. With almost no dissension, they agreed that the key to our success is the quality of the faculty, their openness to change and innovation and their receptiveness to students. (As our local newspaper noted, "Good teachers cost more, but bad teachers cost the most.") Coming in a close second were the strong supportive services provided by the counselors and classified staff and the rapport that exists between them and the faculty. Another important element is the sense of pride in being part of the college community, a contagious factor. The whole thirteen years have been an uphill battle and the staff and the students (and the community now, too) are proud of what has emerged.

An astute, flexible fiscal management was also cited as a contributor to our success. A sophisticated knowledge of state and federal financing and its legal ramifications permits the expedition of numerous pilot and experimental programs before any are wrongly placed within the regular curriculum. A well-timed and visually interesting publicity program has proved effective yet economical. Still another plus is the relatively democratic governance system in which much authority is delegated and redistributed, in which a sincere and earnest attempt is made to get as much input as possible from the various segments of the college community in both policy making and policy evaluation.

Quite a number of other characteristics or programs were praised as well—for instance, the stress on alternate modes of learning, the increase in occupational programs (which have tripled), the emphasis on continuing education, the numerous off-site locations for classes (some fifty-five of these at last count), the extensive cooperation with business and industry which keeps programs up to date and assures more jobs for students, and the "snowball" effect, which describes the fact that people go to college because their friends do (a fact of human nature).

In addition, there are the numerous special programs and classes: "Project 2000," an interdisciplinary-international approach to the future; the child care center for working mothers who are attending college; international trade courses; overseas work experience; TV consortiums (of the twenty-one Bay Area colleges participating, SVC has the largest enrollment); the weekend college; the mini-college (two thousand students); the outreach program and center; the veterans' program (three VA administrators and more than two thousand students); and sophisticated and varied evening offerings, midnight classes, dawn classes. There are senior citizens' classes held on campus and off, as well as conversational language classes. The college has good articulation with the four-year institutions so that most transfer courses are accepted for credit. Students may take various courses on a pass/fail or a credit/no credit basis. (Some change may be in the offing here because of the state enrollment cap.) And then certain restrictive admission requirements have been dropped. For instance, high school transcripts are not immediately required upon registration. Many adult students have been out of school for twenty to forty years, and they sometimes need quite a bit of time to obtain such information. So the college says they need only deliver the transcripts before they graduate or receive a degree.

The Rehabilitation Office makes a contribution too, along with increased financial assistance, a model building program (one of only two, I understand, in the U.S.), the development of state licensing programs for community health workers, medical records keepers, and similar specialists. Faculty members help to recruit students, and "open houses" are sponsored by individual departments and divisions. A Licensed Vocational Nursing Program continues to grow, as does a most active Park Management Program and also a Psychiatric Technological Program.

The Supervision and Management Program, a cooperative effort with San Jose City College, is now in its fourth year. This is the largest program of its kind anywhere in the world and has more than two thousand students whose ages range from nineteen to sixty-five. Their learning occurs in fifteen off-campus locations; twenty-five classes are offered at Memorex alone.

The college has an exceptional Food Services Program, which began more than ten years ago with nineteen students and four classes; now it has thirty-two classes with some one thousand students, and only limited facilities are preventing further expansion. Ten percent of these students go on to a four-year college program; 85 percent get jobs. The restaurant and hotel workers' union is the program's biggest supporter.

The flexible Physical Education and Health Education Programs have replaced the semester-long course with four one-unit courses of nine weeks each on such subjects as aerobic fitness, drug use and abuse, human sexuality, disease and environment. The P.E. program itself is no longer mandatory; however the enrollment has increased by some two thousand students.

New and varied approaches to learning and presentation of classes have done their share too. Examples are: the Shakespeare course that uses sophisticated films by leading actors and actresses, bilingual courses in English and American history, Driver Education for the Spanish-Speaking Person, Human Services Programs (three basic courses taught in two disciplines: Help for the Aging, Nutrition for the Aging, and similar offerings), the Women's Re-entry

Program, and the Women in Transition class. A noticeable change has occurred recently in the attitude of the local high schools toward the community college. This past year half of the graduates of one high school were in attendance at WVC, as opposed to a meager 12 percent the year before.

In conclusion, I believe that in order to weather these crises and manage growth in a creative way, we must know our goals and yet be sensitive to change, accepting problems as challenges and not obstacles. We have, it seems, been constantly heading into the wind. Some age-old philosopher once said: "No wind is good if you don't know where you are going." And we have had pretty strong convictions about our heading and destination. We on the board must be able to sniff the wind, as it were, head into, make use of it. Trustees must respond boldly by developing needed, rational policies, sharing the planning and decision making as we go. However, we must make it very clear, in this redistribution of authority, those who do this sharing with us must also accept some responsibility for creating an environment that promotes learning.

This is no job for the timid, the weak, or the uninterested. It requires strong, sensitive, and diplomatic leadership. The concern for efficiency and economy should facilitate not inhibit decisions. At this point, we might take a bit of wisdom from Abraham Lincoln: "As the case is new, so must we think and act a-new."

Mildred H. Wharton is a member of the governing board of West Valley Community College in Saratoga, California.

What lies ahead for the community colleges? Competition with alternative institutions and a decrease in vocational preparation are two probabilities.

futures

charles mcintyre

The community college in the 1980s will be more flexible, allowing students to come and go more easily, to mix academics with travel, employment, or national service. Variations on the work-study arrangement will make possible the predicted "external degree" program, in which students will be given credit for experience. More short-term courses are also forecast because some people need to upgrade their training, but do not require a full semester or quarter to do so. Courses, too, will reflect the increasing technical needs of society. Classes for the health professions are expected to make significant gains in the 80s and beyond, as are technical courses in data processing and agriculture technology, particularly in the area of ocean farming. With the larger enrollments due in the 1990s (sixteen million nationwide), it will not be feasible to have separate, large campuses. The colleges will resort to, in some cases, a traveling faculty, TV, cassettes, audiovisual aids, and the like, thus reaching a larger locale and more diverse student populations. It is estimated that by 1990 schools will pool their resources more, although because of competition they will be more diversified. By the year 2000 the average work week will probably be cut by between 15 and 30 percent. People will return to the cities again for convenience, instead of spreading out in the suburbs. The death rate is also expected to decrease and people will be living longer. All of these factors indicate that there will be more time for leisure in peoples' lives. The community college is one of the main institutions that will be able to accommodate people and their increasing leisure time.

Four major trends will be evident in the future: (1) increased enrollment of nontraditional students; (2) the rise of alternative educational institutions; (3) decreased undergraduate vocational preparation and certification accompanied by increased short-term skill training; (4) diminution of compulsory education.

Enrollment by persons of the traditional age and ethnic heritage will either decrease or stay fundamentally the same till 1990. The only groups who will increase their attendance are the "nontraditionals": older students, blacks, Chicanos, housewives, blue-collar workers. This projection is supported by the data Allan Cartter has enmassed for the Carnegie Commission. College enrollments are expected to rise approximately 1 percent annually until 1981, when there will be a lull in terms of absolute numbers. There will be about 10 percent fewer high school graduates in the 1980s than in the 1970s because of a drop in the population of this age group. In addition, fewer high school graduates will go immediately to college. As a result, colleges and universities will be competing for students and catering to them. Colleges will seek to maintain enrollment levels by attracting students from other institutions and finding new groups to serve. This effort will engender educational innovation (but will be countered by structural forces to be mentioned later).

This trend toward reaching new segments of the population will bring greater acceptance of higher education as a lifelong process. Contributing to the trend will be the need for more training in order to keep up in one's area of endeavor or to learn totally new skills.

Many people will have to either change jobs several times throughout their lifetimes, and thus be retrained for several different occupations, or upgrade themselves to handle job changes effected by advancements in their field. Consequently, the number of students in degree credit programs is expected to decline while nondegree students increase 38 percent by 1980. Most of the latter will be part-time students (their number is expected to rise 14 percent by 1982) and older people. The courses and delivery systems of the community college must keep up with these social changes—

students will demand a university without walls if they are to enroll. In the next two decades, the survival of many institutions will rest heavily on how willing they are to meet the needs of nontraditional students by making major curricular and personnel adaptations.

The Carnegie Commission indicates a significant rise in the ethnic population. This is largely due to a recent and increasing societal pressure to eradicate the close articulation between the meritocracy and the system of higher education. Ethnic populations are finding education both a good investment and a necessary expenditure. To help with these costs the federal government can be expected to expand aid programs through the 1980s.

The enrollment of women is also expected to be much greater throughout the 1980s. The women's liberation movement is breaking down traditional prejudices and women are having fewer children or spreading their births over a longer period of time. They are spending less time in the home, whether they work or not. As opportunities for women increase, the need for training will also grow.

Until the year 2000 there will be an increase in alternative educational institutions. These fall into four categories: (1) government-funded vocational education centers; (2) transformed educational institutions, such as the Middle College of the City University of New York; (3) businesses and other nonacademic organizations involved in education; and (4) quasi-institutional or noninstitutional education resources, such as Chicago's learning exchange.

These alternative forms will compete significantly with traditional higher education; in fact, they are already doing so. Under the Nixon administration, proprietary education was brought under the umbrella of postsecondary education, so that it now has access to government EOP and veterans' grants. Corporations, too, are coming on strong. The Bell and Howell Schools, for example, are already a lively and flourishing enterprise. Such competition will only become stronger. The obvious consequence is decreased enrollment in traditional colleges and universities, but its extent will depend on what kind of a future these institutions create.

The third projected trend is the most paradoxical. Despite the most recent evidence to the contrary, we will in all probability see a decreased emphasis on undergraduate vocational education over the next twenty-five years. There are at least seven reasons for this. First, well over half of all students graduating from college enter professions for which they received no professional preparation. And achievement in college, as measured by grades, bears little significant relationship to achievement in postacademic situations. Factors such as motivation, socioeconomic background, and self-concept have a much greater bearing on success. Third, knowledge is expanding at such a geometric rate that it is becoming increasingly difficult to master even a small part of the knowledge in any one field. College graduates are finding that the knowledge they acquired as undergraduates is quickly obsolete. Related to all of these is the current crunch in the labor market and an increasing disinterest in accumulating material goods among many young people. It is also becoming increasingly clear that nonvocational efforts will take up more of our lives than employment. The National Association of Business Economists projects some interesting statistics—assuming that we work a forty-hour week and begin employment at age twenty-one, we will, according to the NABE, retire at age thirty-eight after only seventeen years of vocational life.

Finally, professional and vocational certification is beginning to be separated from collegiate preparation. Nursing, law, medicine are all devising alternate certification mechanisms. The real question mark, though, is the action of the Supreme Court. In *Griggs* v. *Duke Power Company*, the Court unanimously ruled that a job could not be denied on the basis of nonreceipt of a high school diploma where such nonreceipt could not be shown to disqualify competence. The extension of this decision could well be significant. If the B.A. were no longer a necessary access credential to many jobs, such as that of a salesman, how many students would abandon traditional higher education for alternative institutions? The Carnegie Commission, through its findings, showed that 80 percent of available jobs will not require a four-year degree. And the career training industries and service organizations, mentioned earlier, are rapidly learning how to teach and apply knowledge to specific tasks. Nevertheless, the two-year public colleges will continue to grow more rapidly than other schools, probably because they do combine vocational and academic programs. Of those planning to enroll in colleges, a greater percentage will choose the community college—about 25 percent more by 1982.

All of these factors combine to suggest that undergraduate institutions eventually may deemphasize vocational preparation and concentrate more on human development. One overall implication is that undergraduate enrollment will decline, because vocational certification is a powerful impetus for entering college and its diminishment will decrease attendance.

The other side of the coin, however, provides the paradox. Many have stressed the fact that the future will demand from us increased social service. In fact, some quasi-volunteer social service requirements may well be established. Taxes will not be sufficient to carry the burden of increasingly necessary social services. Added to this is the growing obsolescence of knowledge and skills. Both of these factors suggest that there will be increased need for short-term training that emphasizes skills, both technical and interpersonal. If higher education recognizes this, as in all probability it will, enrollments should increase, but probably not enough to offset the effects of alternative certification methods and alternative institutions.

The fourth predicted trend is probably the least substantiated. There may well be a major reconsideration of compulsory secondary education. Many people, both in and out of the mythical "establishment," are attacking the concept, and before this century is out we may well see its erosion. Only recently, a task force of the Kettering Foundation suggested ending formal schooling at age fourteen. The enrollment consequence, however, is unclear. More may undertake a higher education because more are eligible. Students may start college at a much younger age, as well as a much older one. On the other hand, diminishing compulsory education may break up the psychological lock-step of schooling. If stopping out becomes easier, people are probably less likely to continue with higher education. All told, the two sides of the coin seem to add up to decreased enrollment.

By the 1980s it is estimated that nearly 90 percent of college faculty members will have tenure. They will thus be in a better position to engage in collective bargaining and ultimately will gain more power than they have ever held. However, with future changes in mind, institutional researchers are pushing faculties to specify what kinds of competence are required in their disciplines and also to develop measures of achievement. They must determine the criteria for giving new teachers tenure, because the faculty in 1980s and 1990s will be drawn increasingly from outside professions. If teachers hold the power in the future, they will be held far more accountable than at the present, particularly by the students, and conversely, if the students hold the power, then they will have to justify their actions. In any event, the matter of accountability will be a major concern in the 1980s and beyond.

Public authorities are sure to gain influence and power because they have the funds to conserve, are better educated, have more information, and also have more skilled analysts. The role of the trustees is also expected to change. They will be forced to behave more as trustees and less as managers of the institutions. They will be asked to move the institution into a position of leadership in the changing society. They must maintain the human assets of the institution as well as answer to the needs of the community and understand the relevance of their educational programs. The trustees of the future will come from fields outside business or law. They will be younger and more conscious of the "outside," thus more sensitive to the will of the people. There will be an increasing reliance on the community for support, so the college must be willing to meet its demands. The best person to handle these demands is the president, who must hold more authority in the future for managing the institution. He or she will undoubtedly be held far more accountable than in the past because the people and the government will no longer stand for nonaccountability. State governments, presently and in the future, are without federal dominance and will exhibit more authority in deciding which courses should be taught, since they are more prone to exercise control than the federal government.

Charles McIntyre is director of analytical studies for the California Community Colleges, with headquarters in Sacramento.

Further resources on effective trusteeship from the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

sources and information

elizabeth rinnander

The sources cited below were chosen because they are considered excellent general references on community college trustees or because they are particularly relevant to the subjects of articles in this issue.

role of the trustee

Bernd (1973) describes the demographic and biographical makeup of community junior college boards of control, their social and political attitudes, and the effects of these backgrounds and attitudes on their role.

The major responsibility of trustees is to make sure that their institution's programs and services are provided to those citizens who can benefit from them both effectively and efficiently, according to Terrey (1973). He further spells out the do's and don'ts of trusteeship, indicating that trustees should never evaluate a plan, since they created it and set its objectives. Because trustees hold assets in trust, neither students nor faculty members, who benefit from that trust, should serve on the board, as this would constitute a conflict of interest. A report designed to provide trustees with a mechanism for discussing their roles and responsibilities, based on a dialogue among board members themselves, is provided by Harper (1974).

The Evaluation of Community College Teaching: Models in Theory and Practice (1972) offers specific suggestions for handling the ever-important task of faculty evaluation. The *Trustee Communicator* ([1974]), from the Association of Community College Trustees, comprises four articles designed to help the trustee deal with various aspects of his or her job. One of them describes ways to strengthen a college's commitment to women faculty members and students in both the curriculum and activities. Guidelines for hiring a superintendent are offered, and characteristics of the successful board chairperson discussed. The communications system used in the San Diego Community College district is outlined, including a flow chart and description of the system's objectives. Mills ([1971]) conducted a study on how trustees are involved in the process of change in their institutions. Most trustees, he found, are elected by direct popular vote and appear to understand and support the concepts of universal higher education and open admissions which are fundamental to the public community colleges.

Unlike the United States, where the board of trustees is a well-established tradition, Canada does not uniformly have such a governance structure for all types of postsecondary institutions. Konrad (1974 and 1975) offers two papers describing how each individual province has legislated for the establishment of governance structures in its own institutions. The tenth issue of *New Directions for Community Colleges* (Richardson, 1975) supplies further information concerning participatory governance in Canada as well as other areas and includes many articles of interest and relevance to the board member. A review of the pertinent literature and a bibliography are provided.

The Trapnell Report (1973) offers a case-study approach to the role and responsibilities of the board of trustees of the Los Angeles Community College District. The author reports on the proceedings of that board's meetings, along with editorials.

Budget and finance are always important to the lay trustee in the community college. McPherran and Barthelme (1974), in their primer for understanding finance in the California community colleges, provide definitions, methods of computing data, and information regarding the state laws. Guidelines and models are supplied, and the Management Information System (MIS) is explained.

Russock (1974) offers a good overview of the role of community college trustees, as does *The Changing Role of the Community College Trustee* (1975), an ERIC brief prepared for the sixth annual convention of the Association of Community College Trustees.

The steady drift toward state control of community college education is a growing concern. Bender (1975) attempts to establish the context of this phenomenon and makes recommendations for action. His suggestions include determining the locus of policy making; untangling overlapping jurisdictions; defining and communicating the mission of the community college; and encouraging local initiative in the political process. The precursors of state control are considered.

In New York State, the Board of Regents and the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York (SUNY) oversee the local institutional boards of trustees. Martorana (1973) calls for a revision of the Community College Law, Article 126, which established this tripartite structure. Needed, he feels, is a clarification of both the power and duties of the local trustees vis-a-vis their local sponsors, and also of the distinctions between the state board's roles and duties as the governing board of SUNY and as a coordinating state-level board for community colleges. He believes that most of the governance tasks should be returned to strong local boards of trustees.

Two-Year Post-Secondary Education in South Carolina (1971) consists of a definition of the community college, an overview of the two-year public colleges in that state, and recommendations. The specific responsibilities of a state board to be established to govern all two-year institutions are delineated. In California, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education has worked well for the three segments of public higher education there--the University of California, the state universities and colleges, and the community colleges. Brossman (1974) explains that the combination of local boards, statewide boards, and the coordinating board provides an effective governance system. He stresses that the local boards must be strictly accountable for managing their own campuses, while the statewide board ensures that due process is observed locally, so that faculty, students, and community members are consulted regularly in the decision-making process.

Day and May ([1974]) conducted a survey in seven states to determine how state agency directors, college presidents, and board chairmen perceived the changes in the powers and duties of local boards as a result of state coordination. They found that in most states the state-level agencies regulated only the public two-year colleges and that statutes delineated the authority of the state and institutional boards. Most local boards were elected, although several were appointed by their governors. The length of terms varied between three and seven years, and most states surveyed did not limit the number of terms that a board member could serve.

Wattenbarger reaffirms the trend toward state-level coordination and control and proposes guidelines for differentiating state and local responsibilities in *The Two-Year College Trustee: National Issues and Perspectives* (1972). In this same report, Gleazer stresses the importance of keeping the locus of control with the local board, rather than allowing the power to be shifted to administrative levels far removed from the local college and community.

trustees and presidents

From the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges comes a *Junior College Research Review* ([1970]) issue concerned with the roles and relationships of trustees and their chief administrative officers. Six ERIC documents are reviewed, including an annotated bibliography on community college boards. Another older but still useful product of this Clearinghouse is Johnson's (1971) *Occasional Report*, which summarizes a 1970 conference on the board of trustees sponsored jointly by the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program, the AAJC New Institutions Project, the Regional Educational Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia, and the Duke University Junior College EPDA Project. Nine presentations are included in the conference proceedings.

Pray (1975) laments that the management and administrative duties of presidents and boards are not clearly delineated. Many presidents, he feels, are forced to devote excessive amounts of time to working with trustees and motivating them to perform their functions because of the political implications of their actions and difficulties implicit in the structure of many boards. Needed are systematic self-studies of the effectiveness of trustees. The author further suggests that the three major national education associations sponsor a program for improving the quality of trustees' leadership.

Frederick (1973) reports on a study of trustees and presidents by the New York State Education Department. Investigated were: the need for orientation and inservice education for trustees; trustee and presidential comprehension of the mission of the comprehensive community college; presidents' perceptions regarding trustees' orientation and education; and the need for help from the state and the university in formulating programs to educate board members.

Smith and Crawford (1972) identify the presidential selection methods of twenty community colleges in six western states and offer guidelines for selecting a president. Hiring a college president is not only the trustees' legal responsibility, but also the most important task they undertake. The whole college community should be involved in developing written procedures for hiring, and careful screening and rescreening of candidates is essential.

trustees and collective bargaining

Many trustees perceive the coming of collective bargaining as an unwanted occurrence. At their 1974 conference, the Association of Community College Trustees passed one resolution to oppose federal or state government imposition of collective bargaining laws, and another to keep the authority over salaries at the local board level (*Trustees: Working Together . . .*, [1974]). Terrey (1973) fears that collective bargaining may be destructive to higher education. So he suggests that bargaining be included in a college's governance structure and that administrative and governance tasks be shared, actions which would change leadership roles and decision-making procedures.

Jacobs (1974) presents his views as a community college trustee who has been personally involved in the problems of collective bargaining. Potter (1974), as chairman of the board of Jackson City College (Mississippi), warns trustees to be prepared for faculty unionization. As he sees it, trustees should fight the enactment of mandatory bargaining laws, and, where these are enacted, they should lobby for provisions outlawing strikes, forbidding administrative unionization, and denying compulsory arbitration. He also considers the composition of the negotiating team (it should never include a president or trustee although other "in-house" personnel are good members), grievance procedures, and dealing with an impasse situation. A model master agreement is included in this document.

Another ERIC document exemplifying a master agreement is *Policies and Procedures for Administrative Personnel, 1974-77* ([1974]), which is the actual negotiated agreement between the Macomb County Community College (Michigan) Association of Administrative Personnel and the board of trustees of the college.

Howe (1973) examines the methods and strategies employed by community college negotiating teams and the role of the board. A step-by-step procedure for negotiations is detailed, with stress on the trustees' functions.

references

The ERIC documents (ED numbers) listed are available on microfiche (MF) or in hard copy (HC) from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), Computer Microfilm International Corporation, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210. The MF price for documents under 470 pages is $0.76. HC prices are: 1-25 pages, $1.58; 26-50, $1.95; 51-75, $3.32; 76-100, $4.43. For materials having more than 100 pages, add $1.27 for each 25-page increment (or fraction thereof). Postage must be added to all orders. Abstracts of these and other documents in the Junior College Collection are available upon request from the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Room 96, Powell Library, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024. Bracketed publication dates are approximate. Revised titles are also bracketed.

Bender, C. W. *The States, Communities, and Control of the Community College: Issues and Recommendations.* Washington: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1975. 63 pp. (ED 110 125)

Bernd, C. M. *The Community Junior College Trustee: Some Questions about Representation.* Unpublished paper, 1973. 13 pp. (ED 086 279)

Brossman, S. W. *Governance and Coordination of California Higher Education.* Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1974. 11 pp. (ED 086 299)

The Changing Role of the Community College Trustee. A brief prepared for the Sixth Annual Convention of the Association of Community College Trustees, Miami Beach, Florida. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1975.

Day, C. W., and May, R. *Effects of State Coordination upon Two-Year College Boards of Trustees.* Unpublished paper, [1974]. 8 pp. (ED 097 924)

The Evaluation of Community College Teaching: Models in Theory and Practice. Proceedings of a Conference on the Evaluation of Teaching, sponsored by the California Junior College Association, Burlingame, California, April 13, 1972. 100 pp. (ED 063 923)

Frederick, R. W., Jr. *Presidents–Trustees and the Comprehensive Two-Year College.* Albany and Ithaca: New York State Education Department, and the State University of New York, 1973. 84 pp. (ED 092 205)

Harper, W. A. (Ed.) *Trustee Papers 2: A Report Prepared by and for Community and Junior College Board Members.* Washington: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and Association of Community College Trustees, 1974. 47 pp. (ED 093 416)

Howe, R. *Community College Board of Trustees and Negotiations with Faculty.* Washington: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and Association of Community College Trustees, 1973. 48 pp. (ED 080 116)

Jacobs, K. J. *Politics of Collective Bargaining.* Paper presented to the Trustee Workshop sponsored by the Illinois Community College Trustee Association and Governance Committee, and the Illinois Council of Public and Community College Presidents, St. Charles, Illinois, February 1974. 49 pp. (ED 092 194)

Johnson, B. L. (Ed.) *The Junior College Board of Trustees.* Occasional Report No. 16. Los Angeles: University of California Junior College Leadership Program, 1971. 62 pp. (ED 078 817)

Junior College Research Review. Vol. IV. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, [1970]. 68 pp. (ED 063 925)

Konrad, A. G. *Decision Making Structures in Community Colleges.* Paper prepared for the College Administration Project Workshop, Regina, Saskatchewan, June 18-21, 1974. 7 pp. (ED 104 479)

Konrad, A. G., and Others. *Would New Board Structures Improve College Governance? A Forum to Examine Canadian Experience.* Forum presentation at the Annual Conference of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Seattle, Washington, April 12-15, 1975. 17 pp. (ED 104 478)

McPherran, A. L., and Barthelme, P. A. *Understanding Community College Finance: A Primer for the Lay Trustee.* Sacramento: California Community Colleges, and California School Boards Association, 1974. 19 pp. (ED 103 064)

Martorana, S. V. *Leadership at the Crossroads: Community Colleges in New York State, 1972.* University Park: Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1973. 24 pp. (ED 100 465)

Mills, P. K. *A Study of the Community College Board of Trustees and the Process of Institutional Change.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers, Graduate School of Education, [1971]. 39 pp. (ED 073 755)

Policies and Procedures for Administrative Personnel, 1974-1977. Warren, Mich.: Macomb County Community College, [1974]. 29 pp. (ED 104 450)

Potter, G. E. *Board vs. Faculty: Collective Bargaining An Adversary Proceeding.* Speech delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Community College Trustees, Portland, Oregon, November 1974. 19 pp. (ED 099 084)

Pray, F. C. *A New Look at Community College Boards of Trustees and Presidents and Their Relationships: Suggestions for Change.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1975. 43 pp. (ED 105 951)

Richardson, R. C., Jr. (Ed.) *Reforming College Governance.* New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 10. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975. (Not available from EDRS. Available for $5.00 from Jossey-Bass, 615 Montgomery St., San Francisco, Calif. 94111.)

Russock, R. "Community College Trustees." *Community College Review,* 1974, *2*(3), 57-62.

Smith, E. P., and Crawford, W. H. *A Guideline of Procedures for Selecting a Community College President. Final Report.* Unpublished paper, 1972. 14 pp. (ED 062 964)

Terrey, J. N. *Planning for Community College Concerns.* Paper presented at the

IASB Annual Meeting, Des Moines, Iowa, November 15, 1973. 14 pp. (ED 086 284)

Trapnell, J. *The Trapnell Report: Community College Concerns.* Los Angeles: Los Angeles Community Colleges, 1973. 16 pp. (ED 085 059)

Trustee Communicator. Washington: Association of Community College Trustees, [1974]. 34 pp. (ED 100 457)

[Trustees: Working Together–Making a Difference.] Report on the Annual Convention (5th, Portland, Oregon, September 26-28, 1974). Washington: Association of Community College Trustees, [1974]. 40 pp. (ED 100 477)

The Two-Year-College Trustee: National Issues and Perspectives. Washington: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1972. 40 pp. (ED 073 757)

Two-Year Post-Secondary Education in South Carolina. Columbia: South Carolina Commission on Higher Education and South Carolina State Committee for Technical Education, 1971. 93 pp. (ED 059 710)

Elizabeth Rinnander is staff research associate at the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

index

Accountability, of trustees, 9, 27-31, 82
Administrators, attitude of, toward trustees, 12-13
Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT), vii, 63, 88, 100, 103
Association of School Boards, 63
Association of Vocational, Technical Institutes, 63
Autonomy, board responsibility for, 6, 10

Barthelme, P. A., 100, 105
Bender, C. W., 101, 104
Bernd, C. M., 99, 104
Boards of trustees: appointment of, 16-18; chairman of, 69-83; characteristics of, 1-2, 66; in collective bargaining involvement of, 54-60; committees of, 79-80; composition of, 11, 70-71; election of, 18-20; evaluation of, 8; and external agents in collective bargaining, 58-60; legal authority of, 47-48; and legal issues, 45-51; as lobbyists, 9-10, 35-36, 51, 61-63; motives of, 16, 21; need for, 8; procedures of, 69-77; recommendations for, 73-77; relationships of, 79-83; responsibilities of, 1-8, 11, 24; roles of, 9-13, 33-37, 98, 99-100; selection of, 15-20; self-evaluation of, 27-31; women on, 21-25, 71
Boren, J., 75
Brossman, S. W., 101, 104
Brown Act, 70
Budget, board responsibility toward, 66-67

California: board meetings in, 69-73; Brown Act of, 70; education code in, 70; enrollment crisis in, 85-92; executive session suit in, 76; funding in, 85, 87, 89, 100; statewide board in, 101; Stull Act of, 73
Calvert, W. B., 61-63
Canada, governance in, 100
Carnegie Commission, 94, 95, 96
Cartter, A., 94
Certification, trend toward, 96
Change, board responsibility for, 6-7
City University of New York, Middle College of, 95
Coleman, H. C., Jr., 27-31
Collective bargaining: analysis of, decision making in, 58-60; case study of, 55-57; causes of, 53-54; conflict resolution in, 49-50; information on, 103-104; laws regarding, 49-50; and management policies, 40, 42; trend in, 97
Community College of Philadelphia (CCP), 53-60
Community colleges: and alternative institutions, 95; future of, 93-98; role of, board responsibility for, 3-5, 13
Corson, J., 7
Crawford, W. H., 103, 105

Danforth, W., 70
Day, C. W., 101-102, 104
Daytona Beach Community College, 27-31
Degrees, denial of, court decisions on, 46-47
Disruptions, court decisions on, 46
Doing, L. T., 24, 25
Doser, B., 9-13
Dzuiba, V., vii-viii

Enrollment: compulsory secondary education and, 97; crisis in, 85-92; factors influencing, 85-88; trends in, 94-95

Facilities, board responsibility for, 3
Faculty: attitude of, toward trustees, 12; dismissal of, 48-49; litigation by, 48-50
Financing, board responsibility for, 65-67
Florida, accountability in, 27

Frederick, R. W., Jr., 102-103, 104
Funding: federal pattern of, 10; state policies of, 85, 87, 89

Galbraith, J. K., 87
Gardiner, R. A., 53-60
Gibbs, M. C. K., 69-77
Gleazer, E. J., Jr., 102
Goddard, J., 15-20, 33-37
Governor, trustee appointment by, 16-17
Griggs v. *Duke Power Company*, 96
Guthrie, J. W., 69-70

Harper, W. A., 99, 104
Harvard University, 41
Howe, R., 59, 60, 104, 105

Information, board responsibility for, 7, 33-34, 36, 81
Iowa, written policies in, 39, 40

Jackson City College (Mississippi), 103
Jackson Community College (Michigan), 4-5, 6
Jacobs, K. J., 103, 105
Jensen, B. A., 39-43
Johnson, B. L., 102, 105

Kettering Foundation, 97
Konrad, A. G., 100, 105

LaCombe, V. A., 15-20, 27, 30, 33-37
Law: board responsibility for, 45-51; competent counsel on, 51; importance of understanding, 45-46, 50-51
Lincoln, A., 92
Litigation: by faculty, 48-50; public, 50; by students, 46-48
Los Angeles Community College, 100

McIntyre, C., 93-98
Macomb County Community College, 103
McPherran, A. L., 100, 105
Management: board responsibility for, 2-3, 33-37; characteristics of, 41; in personal style, 41-43
Martorana, S. V., 101, 105
Mathews, F. L., 65-67
May, R., 101-102, 104
Meardy, W., vii-viii
Michigan: coordinating board in, 6; court ruling in, 49
Mills, P. K., 100, 105
Mullins, C., 24, 25

National Association of Business Economists, 96
New Jersey, court ruling in, 49
New York: court ruling in, 49; statewide board in, 101; trustees and presidents in, 102-103
Newspapers, student, court decisions on, 47

Pennsylvania, strike legality in, 56, 57
Performance, institutional, board responsibility for, 6
Planning, board responsibility for, 7
Policies: personal style of, 41-43; written, 39-40
Polk, C. H., 15-20, 27-31, 33-37
Potter, G. E., 1-8, 45-51, 103, 105
Pray, F. C., 102, 105
President: board responsibility for, 2, 33-34, 81-82, 102-103; chairman's relationship with, 80-81; characteristics of, 41-42; and relations with trustees, 18, 33-37, 80-82; roles of, 33-37
Princeton University, 8
Public relations, board responsibility for, 5-6, 36, 82-83

Richardson, R. C., Jr., 100, 105
Rinnander, E., 99-106
Russock, R., 100, 105

San Diego Community College, 100
San Jose City College, 91
Seifert, D. A., 79-83
Smith, E. P., 103, 105
Smith, J. A., 21-25
South Carolina, statewide board in, 101
Statewide boards: increase of, 10; information on, 101-102
Strikes, characteristics of, 49
Students: attitude of, toward trustees, 8, 11-12; litigation by, 46-48; nontraditional, 94-95; women as, 86, 95

Terrey, J. N., 99, 103, 105-106
Trapnell, J., 100, 106
Trustees. *See* Boards of trustees

Unions. *See* Collective bargaining

Virginia, court ruling in, 50
Vocational education, decreased emphasis on, 95-97

Wattenbarger, J. L., 102
West Valley Community College, 88-92
Wharton, M. H., 85-92
Wisconsin: lobbyists in, 62; vocational education in, 63
Women: as students, 86, 95; as trustees, 21-25, 71

NEW DIRECTIONS QUARTERLY SOURCEBOOKS

New Directions for Community Colleges is one of three quarterly publications of Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers. Each series provides concise, practical, and timely assistance on a pressing educational topic. Topics and issue editors for each series are listed below.

Yearly subscription rates for each series are $25 for institutions, libraries, and agencies, and $15 for individuals when paid by personal check. To subscribe, or to receive further information, write: *New Directions* Subscriptions, Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 615 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California 94111.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

JB Lon Hefferlin, Editor-in-Chief

1973– 1. *Facilitating Faculty Development,* Mervin Freedman
2. *Strategies for Budgeting,* George Kaludis
3. *Services for Students,* Joseph Katz
4. *Evaluating Learning and Teaching,* Robert Pace
1974– 5. *Encountering the Unionized University,* Jack Schuster
6. *Implementing Field Experience Education,* John Duley
7. *Avoiding Conflict in Faculty Personnel Practices,* Richard Peairs
8. *Improving Statewide Planning,* James Wattenbarger, Louis Bender
1975– 9. *Planning the Future of the Undergraduate College,* Donald Trites
10. *Individualizing Education by Learning Contracts,* Neal Berte
11. *Meeting Women's New Educational Needs,* Clare Rose
12. *Strategies for Significant Survival,* Clifford Stewart, Thomas Harvey
1976–13. *Promoting Consumer Protection for Students,* Joan Stark
14. *Expanding Recurrent and Nonformal Education,* David Harman
15. *A Comprehensive Approach to Institutional Development,* William Bergquist, William Shoemaker

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Arthur M. Cohen, Editor-in-Chief
Florence B. Brawer, Associate Editor

1973– 1. *Toward a Professional Faculty,* Arthur Cohen
2. *Meeting the Financial Crisis,* John Lombardi
3. *Understanding Diverse Students,* Dorothy Knoell
4. *Updating Occupational Education,* Norman Harris

1974– 5. *Implementing Innovative Instruction*, Roger Garrison
6. *Coordinating State Systems*, Edmund Gleazer, Roger Yarrington
7. *From Class to Mass Learning*, William Birenbaum
8. *Humanizing Student Services*, Clyde Blocker
1975– 9. *Using Instructional Technology*, George Voegel
10. *Reforming College Governance*, Richard Richardson
11. *Adjusting to Collective Bargaining*, Richard Ernst
12. *Merging the Humanities*, Leslie Koltai
1976–13. *Changing Managerial Perspectives*, Barry Heermann
14. *Reaching Out Through Community Service*, Hope Holcomb
15. *Enhancing Trustee Effectiveness*, Victoria Dzuiba, William Meardy

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
Sidney Suslow, Editor-in-Chief
Paul Jedamus, Associate Editor
1974– 1. *Evaluating Institutions for Accountability*, Howard Bowen
2. *Assessing Faculty Effort*, James Doi
3. *Toward Affirmative Action*, Lucy Sells
4. *Organizing Nontraditional Study*, Samuel Baskin
1975– 5. *Evaluating Statewide Boards*, Robert Berdahl
6. *Assuring Academic Progress Without Growth*, Allan Cartter
7. *Responding to Changing Human Resource Needs*, Paul Heist, Jonathan Warren
8. *Measuring and Increasing Academic Productivity*, Robert Wallhaus
1976– 9. *Assessing Computer-Based Systems Models*, Thomas Mason
10. *Examining Departmental Management*, James Montgomery, James Smart
11. *Allocating Resources Among Departments*, Paul L. Dressel, Lou Anna Kimsey Simon

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

DEC 3 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES